DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 421 460 SP 038 028

AUTHOR Provenzo, Eugene F., Jr.; McCloskey, Gary N.

TITLE Schoolteachers and Schooling: Ethoses in Conflict. Social and Policy Issues in Education: The David C. Anchin Series.
ISBN ISBN-1-56750-248-2
PUB DATE 1996-00-00
NOTE 201p.
AVAILABLE FROM Ablex Publishing Corporation, 355 Chestnut Street, Norwood, NJ 07648 ($39.50).
PUB TYPE Books (010) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Power Structure; Professional Autonomy; *Teacher Attitudes; Teachers; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS Ethos

ABSTRACT

This book pursues empirical and qualitative inquiries about teachers and the meaning they find in their work. Data come from research conducted in 1984-1985. The study examined various themes and issues on how teachers' attitudes have remained constant or changed in the 2 decades following a similar study. Interviews with teachers as part of the National Institute of Education study were the main source of information. In the study, principals and classroom teachers from all grade levels and socioeconomic levels were surveyed and historical data were collected. The book's 9 chapters discuss the following: (1) "Teachers and a Changing Society: 1964-1984"; (2) "The New Ethos of Schooling and Strains on Teachers"; (3) "The Freedom to Teach"; (4) "Teacher's Freedom and Educational Choice"; (5) "The Authority to Teach"; (6) "Teachers' Authority in the New School Culture"; (7) "The Power to Teach"; (8) "Teachers' Power in a Negotiated Environment"; and (9) "Conclusion: Facing the Structural Strains of the Occupation." The book concludes that teaching contains constants that transcend different historical periods in important ways. For example, the fact that teaching as an occupation emphasizes psychic rather than material rewards reinforces teachers' individualistic orientations. However, teachers' ability to exercise what they regard as the freedom, authority, and power appropriate for their work has been greatly affected since the mid-1960s as the ethos of schooling has been changed and redefined. Two appendixes contain interview questions and interviewees' citations. (Contains 79 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 421 460

Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr.
and
Gary N. McCloskey, O.S.A.

SP030028

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Bernstein

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

SCHOOLTEACHERS AND SCHOOLING: ETHOSES IN CONFLICT

Social and Policy Issues in Education:
The David C. Anchin Series

Kathryn M. Borman, Series Editor

Assessment, Testing, and Evaluation in Teacher Education
edited by Suzanne W. Soled

Knowledge and Pedagogy: The Sociology of Basil Bernstein
edited by Alan R. Sadovnik

Children Who Challenge the System
edited by Anne M. Bauer and Ellen M. Lynch

Contemporary Issues in U.S. Education
edited by Dolores Stegelin

Critical Education for Work
edited by Richard D. Lakes

Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students:
School-based Strategies for Diverse Student Populations
edited by Howard Johnston and Kathryn M. Borman

Home Schooling: Political, Historical, and Pedagogical Perspectives
edited by Jan Van Galen and Mary Anne Pitman

Investing in U.S. Schools: Directions for Educational Policy
edited by Bruce A. Jones and Kathryn M. Borman

Minority Education: Anthropological Perspectives
edited by Evelyn Jacob and Cathie Jordan

Schoolteachers and Schooling: Ethoses in Conflict
by Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., and Gary N. McCloskey, O.S.A.

Social Reconstruction Through Education:
The Philosophy, History, and Curricula of a Radical Ideal
edited by Michael E. James

IN PREPARATION:

Implementing Educational Reform: Sociological Perspectives on Educational Policy
edited by Kathryn M. Borman, Peter W. Cookson, Jr., Alan R. Sadovnik, and Joan Z. Spade

SCHOOLTEACHERS AND SCHOOLING: ETHOSES IN CONFLICT

Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr.
University of Miami

Gary N. McCloskey, O.S.A.
St. Thomas University

Ablex Publishing Corporation
Norwood, New Jersey

Copyright © 1996 by Ablex Publishing Corporation

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without permission of the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America
Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Provenzo, Eugene F.
Schoolteachers and schooling ethoses in conflict / Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., Gary N. McCloskey.
p. cm. — (Social and policy issues in education)
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.
ISBN 1-56750-247-4 (cloth). — ISBN 1-56750-248-2 (pbk.)
1. Teachers—United States—Social conditions. 2. Teachers—United States—Attitudes. 3. Teachers—United States—Interviews. I. McCloskey, Gary N. II. Title. III. Series.LB1775.2.P76 1996
371.1'00973—dc20

96-22351
CIP

Ablex Publishing Corporation
355 Chestnut Street
Norwood, New Jersey 07648

Contents

Preface	vii
1. Teachers and a Changing Society: 1964–1984	1
2. The New Ethos of Schooling and Strains on Teachers	17
3. The Freedom to Teach	21
4. Teacher's Freedom and Educational Choice	51
5. The Authority to Teach	61
6. Teachers' Authority in the New School Culture	95
7. The Power to Teach	115
8. Teachers' Power in a Negotiated Environment	143
9. Conclusion: Facing the Structural Strains of the Occupation	157
Appendix A	167
Appendix B	173
References	177
Author Index	183
Subject Index	185

Preface

The research for this book grew out of a larger study sponsored by the National Institute of Education titled, "Teacher Work Rewards and Incentives: 1964–1984." That study, in turn, was based on research conducted by Dan Lortie (1975) during the mid-1960s for his book *Schoolteacher*.[1] This work is not intended as a sequel to *Schoolteacher*; instead, it attempts to follow Lortie's lead by pursuing empirical and qualitative inquiries about teachers and the meaning they find in their work.

The data on which this study is based were collected primarily by Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., Marilyn M. Cohn, and Robert B. Kottkamp between April 1984 and July 1985. The three researchers take equal responsibility for the data collection. In the final phase of the data collection (Summer 1985), Gary N. McCloskey, OSA, became involved in the project.[2] Various articles, reports, and conference papers have presented different aspects of our findings. These studies are cited throughout this work and are included in the bibliography.

---

[1] "Teacher Work, Incentives and Rewards: A Twenty Year Perspective." National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education (Contract-G-83-0067). This project focused primarily on teacher's perceptions and attitudes toward their work; as its baseline it used data collected by Lortie in the mid-1960s for his classic work *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

[2] The origins of the National Institute of Education study date back to spring 1979. Dan Lortie came to Miami as the keynote speaker for the University of Miami School of Education's annual research conference. While waiting with Professor Lortie for his flight back to Chicago, one of the authors (Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr.) suggested the possibility that he return to Dade County as a research site and repeat many of the ques-

This particular study represents a collaborative between Provenzo and McCloskey. It was influenced by numerous discussions with our coresearchers, Marilyn M. Cohn and Robert B. Kottkamp, but stands independent of them.[2] As the authors of this work, we accept responsibility for the opinions and interpretations expressed here.

The purpose of this study is to examine a series of themes and issues that we believe are particularly important in light of the information that emerged for us from the data we collected in the teacher survey and in interviews for the National Institute of Education study. Our interpretation is further informed by research that has been underway since 1985; Asterie Baker Provenzo and Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr. are gathering material for an urban educational history

tions that were asked in the original 1964 study, with the idea of determining changes that might have occurred in the teaching profession over the intervening period. Lortie said that he thought the idea was excellent, but had no immediate interest in pursuing the research himself, and encouraged Provenzo to undertake the project.

The research that was eventually undertaken extended Lortie's work through the use of a teacher survey, administered in April 1984, an interview study conducted between May 1984 and August 1985, and the collection of a limited amount of historical data. This work was conducted under the direction of Provenzo, with the assistance of Cohn and Kottkamp. Questions used in the interviews replicated much of Lortie's study, which focused on work rewards and incentives for teachers. New questions were asked about current issues such as merit pay, the decline in respect for the teaching profession, and parents' involvement in their children's education. McCloskey became involved in the study during the interviewing.

The teacher survey drew a 40% random sample of classroom teachers (N = 4, 247 from each school in the Dade County Public School system (N = 251). A total of 2,718 teachers (64%) responded to the survey. From the 40% sample, a stratified random sample of 100 teachers was drawn for interviews. We accomplished stratification by assigning each school to a 3 by 3 matrix consisting of three levels of socioeconomic status and three levels of grade range (elementary, junior high, and senior high). We randomly selected 36 school for the nine cells, and then randomly selected teachers within each school. A total of 73 teachers eventually participated in the interviews, of whom 53 were women and 20 were men. The grade-level figures were 30 elementary, 17 junior high, and 26 senior high. The ethnic mix was 47 White, 16 Black, and 10 Hispanic. In this book and other articles we have published in connection with this study each of the quotes from the interviews is identified by a number assigned to each interviewee and a designation for gender, ethnicity (Black, Hispanic, White), school grade level (elementary, junior, senior), school socioeconomic level (low, medium, high), and interviewee's teaching area.

In the summer of 1985, we conducted a related survey of principals. Once again, this study built on research originally conducted by Lortie in his 1964 study in Dade County. This research was directed by Kottkamp and Provenzo. Several dissertations based on this research have been undertaken at Rutgers University, where Kottkamp was a professor.

[2]The book that they produced from their analysis of this Information data is Marilyn M. Cohn and Robert B. Kottkamp, *Teachers: The Missing Voice in Education* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1993).

of the Dade County Public Schools, to be titled *Education on the Forgotten Frontier*.[4]

More specifically, this study examines how teachers' attitudes have remained constant or have changed in light of their historical experience in the two decades that elapsed between Lortie's research and our inquiry. Our research is especially concerned with teachers' personal constructions of freedom, authority, and power. We also examine how teachers' understanding of freedom, authority, and power informs their understanding of the function of schooling, their role in schooling, and the impact of recent reforms in education.

The 73 interviews conducted with teachers as part of the National Institute of Education study are the single most important source for this book. In those interviews we replicated many of the questions asked by Lortie in his interviews of teachers in the "Five Towns" study conducted in the Boston area during the mid-1960s. Lortie's "Five Towns" interviews became an important part of his research for *Schoolteacher*.

Many of the questions we asked were new, however. Although the interviews had been piloted carefully, we modified them as the data collection progressed. There were many reasons for these changes. For example, the teachers interviewed often spoke of the historical forces that shaped and influenced them, but they rarely did so when asked direct questions in this area. As a result, when asked their recollections of specific events—the teachers' strike in 1968, for example, or the reassignment of teachers under the court desegregation order of 1970—our respondents provided only limited information. Thus, we deemphasized some of the questions in later interviews, and added new questions related to administrative control and organization, about which the early teacher interviews reflected concerns. Appendix A is the basic interview schedule used in the study.

Analysis of the interview data, as well as the survey data, became much more complicated and more difficult than originally anticipated. Differences in the four researchers' methodological focus and philosophical perspectives caused us to emphasize the analysis of different questions and issues. Some of these differences are reflected in the conference papers, reports, articles, and other materials that have appeared thus far as part of this research.

---

[4]The full working title for this project is *Education on the Forgotten Frontier: The History of the Dade County Public Schools, 1885–1985*. Conference papers based on the research for this study are listed in the bibliography. Also see Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr. and Asterie B. Provenzo, *Education on the Forgotten Frontier: A Centennial Celebration. 1885–1985* (Miami, Florida: Dade County Public Schools, 1985).

During the interviews, the researchers found that many of the most valuable insights provided by the teachers we interviewed came from their general comments and discussions. Examples can be found in two studies on which we have worked particularly: "Teacher Reactions to Legislated Learning"[5] and "Metaphor and Meaning in the Language of Teachers."[6]

In "Teacher' Reactions to Legislated Learning," although many of our questions focused on the impact of administration and school policies, we discovered that under the surface of the teachers' responses was a series of rich and complex discussions on the nature of bureaucracy, the impact of legislated reforms, and issues involving regulation and control that affected them in their day-to-day work.

Similarly, in the research for "Metaphor and Meaning in the Language of Teachers," we found that the interviews with teachers were a rich source of information on teachers' feelings about their profession. They expressed these feelings in their use of metaphors—metaphors that they employed in response to more general questions about their work. Teachers described how they rode "emotional roller coasters" and had to "dig under the sand" to find rewards in what they did. Using a two-stage coding system, we identified many of the metaphors used by the teachers in the interviews. Then we broke down their meanings into three identifiable questions, which the metaphors addressed: a) "What is a teacher?" b) "What does a teacher experience?" and c) "How does a teacher function as part of the system?"

At this second level of analysis, we believe that the data from the National Institute of Education research interviews have been the richest and most revealing. This work is derived largely from the data taken from interviews at this level of the study.

This book, which resulted from concerns expressed by teachers, is concerned primarily with questions related to teachers' perceptions of their freedom, their authority, and their power, as well as their perception of their understanding of the meaning of schooling and their

---

[5]Gary N. McCloskey, O.S.A., Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., Marilyn M. Cohn and Robert B. Kottkamp, "Teacher Reactions to Legislated Learning," *Educational Policy*, Vol. 5, #3, September 1991, pp. 251–265. A more extensive report of these issues can be found in Gary N. McCloskey, O.S.A., Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., Marilyn M. Cohn and Robert B. Kottkamp, "A Profession at Risk: Legislated Learning as a Disincentive to Teaching." Unpublished report. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, DC, 1987. ERIC Document # ED 284 844.

[6]Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., Gary N. McCloskey, O.S.A., Robert B. Kottkamp, and Marilyn M. Cohn, "Metaphor and Meaning in the Language of Teachers," *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 90, #4, Summer 1989, pp. 551–573.

role in schooling. In fact, we found these issues discussed either directly or indirectly throughout all of the interviews. In addition, we are particularly interested in these issues in light of the recent reform movements in education.

Although we have drawn on theoretical work by a number of scholars and researchers in the field, we have tried as much as possible to focus on the concerns and evidence provided by persons actually working in the field—the teachers themselves. We hope this study will extend a powerful, useful dialogue—one that draws actively on the voices and insights of the subjects who are studied, on their experience, and on the theoretical constructs provided by the researchers from whom we draw insight for much of our interpretation.

Finally, we must recognize the single most important influence in our undertaking the arguments for this book—the research conducted by Dan C. Lortie for *Schoolteacher*. Lortie's *Schoolteacher* provides the foundation for any understanding or interpretation of the sociology of American teachers' work. In this sense, to quote the English medieval political theorist John of Salisbury in his *Policraticus*, in undertaking this research "we are but dwarfs standing on the shoulders of a giant." In recognition of our debt, it is with admiration, respect, and a deep sense of obligation that we dedicate this book to Dan C. Lortie.

1

Teachers and a Changing Society: 1964–1984

In *Schoolteacher*, Lortie (1975) inquired about the "various sentiments teachers hold toward their daily tasks" (p. viii). In doing so, he wished to explore the ethos of the occupation of schoolteaching—that is, "the pattern of orientations and sentiments which is peculiar to teachers and which distinguishes them from other occupations" (p. viii). Lortie's main concerns were recruitment, socialization, and the distribution of career rewards. He was particularly interested in the unique characteristics of teachers' work that made it different from other occupations. This study is concerned with a separate but closely related issue: How has the changing ethos of schooling transformed and redefined what it means to be a teacher?

This distinction between the ethos of teaching and the ethos of schooling is an important one. As we demonstrate through the comparison of survey data collected by Lortie in Dade County in 1964 with data that we collected for our National Institute of Education study in 1984, the fundamental reasons why people are drawn to the teaching profession, and the types of individuals who derive pleasure and a sense of accomplishment from its demands, have remained remarkably stable from the mid-1960s through the mid-1980s and beyond.[1]

What has changed since the mid-1960s, as pointed out so astutely by Grant (1988), is "the climate or the ethos" of the schools (p. 3). We demonstrate here that although teachers' fundamental attitudes—

[1] For background on changes and stability in teachers' belief systems from 1964 to 1984, see Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn (1986c).

including their reasons for teaching—may not have changed significantly in the last two decades, the challenges they face related to their individual freedom, their moral and social authority, and their power have altered dramatically.

DEFINING THE ETHOS OF SCHOOLING

What are we referring to when we speak of the ethos of schooling? The dictionary defines *ethos* as "the fundamental character or spirit of a culture; the underlying sentiment that informs the beliefs, customs or practices of a group or society." The Greek root for the word refers to "the habits of an animal in a place" (Grant, 1988, p. 177). According to Grant (1988), "Ethos is the sharing of attitudes, values, and beliefs that bond disparate individuals into a community" (p. 117).

How does the ethos of a culture, or of its schools, come to be defined? The existing terminology is vague and imprecise. *Mores*, which Webster says are "folkways of central importance accepted without question and embodying the fundamental moral views of a group," play an important role. In the United States, the importance of mores in the definition of the culture was recognized early. In *Democracy in America*, 19th-century French commentator Alexis de Tocqueville (1969) argued that American mores (*moeurs*), rather than laws, were the key to the maintenance of the democracy in the United States. According to Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, and Tipton (1985) de Tocqueville

> speaks of mores somewhat loosely, defining them variously as "habits of the heart"; notions, opinions and ideas that "shape mental habits"; and the sum of moral and intellectual dispositions of men in society. Mores seem to involve not only ideas and opinions, but habitual practices with respect to such things as religion, political participation, and economic life. (p. 37)

For de Tocqueville, these mores or "habits of the heart" derived from the combination of formal instruction, informal nurture, and individual self-reflection that constituted the basic education of the American citizenry (Cremin, 1980).

"Habits of the heart" also shaped the content of schooling. At about the time when de Tocqueville undertook his analysis of U.S. society, the public educational system or common schools began to coalesce and be defined. Institutions and social forms established at

this time as part of the common school movement have survived into our own era.

Sustained influence of this type—influence that maintains itself not simply over decades but through generations—is being examined increasingly by social scientists. In a classic study on social structure and organizations, for example, Stinchcombe (1965) stated that organizations tend to reflect the circumstances that prevailed when they were established. Precedents established as part of the common school movement of the 1830s and 1840s continue to shape and influence the experience and lives of teachers today. The easing of entry and the feminization of the teaching profession, for example, which occurred in the initial phases of the common school movement, still influence teachers' experience. Likewise, as Lortie (1986) argued, because teachers at the turn of the century tended to be considerably younger and less well trained, and were typically female and single, the architects of the large city school systems in the United States were given "a rationale for placing the decision-making authority in the hands of higher-level board members and central administrators" (p. 570). Once established, these models survived and have become part of the ethos of schooling.

As we argue throughout this work, these historical precedents have not only helped to define the ethos of schooling, but also are part of what Cremin (1980) called "an American *paideia*": "The signal achievement of popular education during the first century of the republic was to help define an American *paideia* and teach it to a polyglot population spread across a continent" (p. 507).

The American *paideia* that emerged by the beginning of the 20th century was Christian, celebrating the values of both the Old and the New Testament. It was largely Protestant, White, and male. It celebrated the values of the Constitution and denied equitable treatment to many of the country's citizens. In this work we argue that a new *paideia*, and in turn a new ethos of schooling, has come into being since the mid-1960s—one that has significantly shaped the experience of teachers in their day-to-day work.

The New Paideia as Shaping the Ethos of Schooling

Cremin (1976) argued that the use of the term *paideia* is valuable because of the various meanings it can incorporate: "The ancient Greeks used it variously and often interchangeably to mean educa-

tion, culture, or social, political, or ethical aspiration. I am using it in this instance primarily in the last sense" (p. 39).[2]

Social, political, and ethical aspirations, according to Cremin, are defined in communal life. How communal life is defined is critical to understanding the ethos of schooling, because communal forces shape that ethos.

Communal forces are complex and difficult to define. Some are more obvious than others. In Cremin's (1976) view, these forces have created a revolution in education, which he believes may be as profound as the development of public schools in the mid-19th century. In his words:

> It is a revolution compounded of several elements—the rapid expansion of higher education to a point where one out of every two high-school graduates has been going on to college; the massive shifts in population, from east to west, from south to north, from country to city, and from city to suburb, which have created new and extraordinary clienteles to educate; the movement of women into the labor force in unprecedented numbers, with prodigious consequences for the family; the changing character of work associated with the emergence of postindustrial society, and in particular the rapid growth of the so-called knowledge industries; the various civil rights and liberation movements of the 1960s, which so radically changed the management and politics of education. (p. ix)

Cremin went on to say that "beneath all of these—and relentlessly affecting them has been the educational transformation wrought by mass television" (p. ix).

To what extent have the expansion of higher education, massive population shifts, women's movement into the labor force, the changing character of work associated with postindustrial society, the civil rights and women's liberation movements, and television contributed to the definition of a new ethos of schooling? We can begin to answer this question by examining the changes that occurred in education and society from the mid-1960s to the mid-1980s.

THE HAND OF HISTORY: 1964–1984

Lortie (1975) opened *Schoolteacher* with a chapter titled "The Hand of History," in which he chronicled the development of the teaching

[2] The classic work on the concept of *paideia* is Jaeger (1939–1944).

profession from the colonial period to the present.[3] At the beginning of the chapter he quoted the French anthropologist Levi-Strauss:

> By showing institutions in the process of transformation, history alone makes it possible to abstract the structure which underlies the many manifestations and remains permanent throughout a succession of events. (p. 1)

Such an approach remains fundamental to our own work. The two decades between Lortie's study of teachers and their work in Dade County and our research in the same setting represent a period of remarkable change for both U.S. society and the teachers who worked in its schools. This was most clearly the case in the area of civil rights.

The Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s

The year 1964 was a watershed in terms of U.S. history, one reflecting the emergence of a new set of values concerning the equity and the rights of citizens. Shortly after the assassination of John F. Kennedy in November 1963, President Lyndon B. Johnson said in his first address to Congress, "We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for one hundred years or more. It is time to write the next chapter—and to write it in the books of law" (cited in Ravitch, 1983, p. 141). On July 2, 1964 Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a complex document covering a wide range of topics. Title I of the Act extended federal safeguards concerning the right to vote. Title II prohibited discrimination on account of race, religion, or national origin in places of public accommodation. Title III granted the Attorney General the power to desegregate public facilities. Title IV directed federal officials to conduct a survey on the equality of education and to provide technical assistance in desegregating the schools. Other sections of the Act banned discrimination in any federal program on the basis of race, religion, sex, or national origin (Ravitch, 1983).

The passage of the Civil Rights Act was part of the emergence of a new ethos of schooling. The purpose of the law, according to Johnson, was to

---

[3] A comprehensive history of the teaching profession in the United States is provided by Warren (1989).

> . . . not restrict the freedom of any American so long as he respects the rights of others. It does not give special treatment to any citizen. It does say the only limit to a man's hope for happiness and for the future of his children shall be his own ability. (Ravitch, 1983, p. 142)[4]

In May 1964, only a few weeks before the passage of the Civil Rights Act, Johnson had called for the creation of the "Great Society." A new philosophy of social justice and politics was sweeping the land. In the November presidential election, Johnson routed the conservative candidate Barry Goldwater, winning more votes and a larger plurality than any previous candidate in U.S. history. In the months following the election, Johnson took advantage of an overwhelmingly Democratic majority in Congress to implement a series of wide-reaching social reforms. The passage of the Economic Opportunity Act (1964), the Voting Rights Act (1965), and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) represented important continuations of the work begun by the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The passage of major civil rights legislation during the mid-1960s provided an important model for other groups seeking social change in American culture. According to Ravitch (1983):

> Advocates of bilingual education and the feminist movement adapted their strategies to the civil rights model because it offered a way not only to bypass local and state education authorities but to compel these officials to accept rules over which they had little control. (pp. 305–306)

In higher education, the passage of Title IX prohibited antinepotism rules that prevented the hiring of faculty members' spouses, as well as providing better athletic facilities and more scholarship money to female athletes (Ravitch, 1983).

At the elementary and secondary level, decisions such as the Supreme Court's 1974 *Lau v. Nichols* required schools to create special programs for non-English-speaking children. Using arguments drawn directly from the civil rights movement, the Court argued that "there is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers and curriculum; for students

---

[4] According to Ravitch (1983):

> At the time it seemed conclusively settled that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 had at last removed from government the power to classify people by race or group identity and had at last empowered the federal government to protect its citizens against arbitrary discrimination in the exercise of their rights. (p. 143)

who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education" (cited in Ravitch, 1983, p. 274).

Arguments similar to those used in *Lau* led to the passage, in 1975, of Public Law 94–142, the "Education for All Handicapped Children Act." Under this law, handicapped children were to be provided with "a free appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs" (cited in Ravitch, 1983, p. 308).

The civil rights movement, as manifested in the quest for racial and ethnic equality as well as women's rights and the rights of the handicapped, was among the most significant social changes to emerge in the decade between the mid-1960s and the mid-1970s. In this period, during which the United States passed through the upheaval of the Vietnam War as well as the Watergate scandal, a new politics of education emerged. Political and social pressures converged on schools and universities, undermining their traditional authority and forcing them to assume new roles. In the elementary and secondary schools, these pressures redefined the traditional ethos of schooling.

How profound were these changes? Ravitch (1983) wrote:

> In elementary and secondary schools, almost no area of administrative discretion was left uncontested: students demanded new rights and freedoms; teachers' unions asserted a new militancy; political action groups complained about books in the classrooms and libraries, for reasons of sexism, racism, or immorality; the courts ordered the busing of students in many communities, as well as reassignment of faculty, to achieve racial integration; congress, the courts, federal agencies, and state legislatures imposed special mandates across a wide range of issues, such as restricting or requiring certain tests, setting standards of promotion and graduation, and establishing new requirements governing the treatment of handicapped students and of students who were either female or members of a racial or linguistic minority. (pp. 267–268)

Taken by themselves, the arguments outlined by Ravitch—which deal almost exclusively with issues of equity and civil rights—would suggest the creation of a new ethos of schooling. Yet such issues were by no means the only factors responsible for redefining the ethos of schooling between the mid-1960s and the mid-1980s. Referring to the forces outlined by Cremin, we can point to additional factors that have shaped American culture since the mid-1960s, and that we believe, on the basis of our research with teachers for this study, have strongly influenced the ethos of schooling. One of the most significant

of these was the redefinition of the traditional household, a change of potentially profound importance to the relationship between students and schools.

Changing Household Patterns

Declining birth rates, the rapid increase of women in the workforce, the postponement of marriage and childrearing, the increasing number of single parents, and the growing numbers of children who are part of serial or simultaneous families, are demographic variables that have increasingly characterized U.S. households and families between the mid-1960s and the mid-1980s (Kagan, 1987).

The magnitude of this change can be seen in the statistics on children's living arrangements. Of 62.5 million children under age 18 in 1985, 14.6 million, or 23% lived with only one parent, in contrast to 12% in 1970 and 9% in 1960. In 1985, 9 out of 10 children living with only one parent lived with their mother. In that year, 54% of all Black children lived with one parent. This figure was 29% for Hispanic children and 18% for White children (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1985).

These statistics suggest that between 1964, when Lortie began to collect the data for *Schoolteacher*, and the mid-1980s, when we began to collect our follow-up data, the traditional roles and structure of American households underwent a major shift that contributed to changes in realities in schools.

Just as important as changes in childrens' living arrangements has been women's increased entry into the labor force since the mid-1960s. To illustrate the dramatic nature of this increase, the proportion of women working outside the home increased from approximately 30% in 1960 to 50% in 1980.

The movement of women into the labor force represents what theorists such as Coleman (1987) regard as a further decrease of parental presence in the household, leading to a significant erosion of the social capital available to children. Such erosion, as part of a redefinition of traditional households, is simply the tip of the iceberg. It has been affected to a great degree by the decline of community institutions involving adult leadership for children. According to Coleman:

> In the community outside the family, the erosion of social capital, in the form of effective norms of social control, adult sponsored youth organizations, and informal relations between children and adults, has

> been even greater. The earlier migration of father from household and neighborhood during the day, and the very recent migration of mothers from the household into the labor force has meant reduced participation in community organizations, like the PTA, Scouting, and others. In addition, the society has been invaded by an advanced individualism, in which cultivation of one's own well-being has replaced interest in others. Indicators are the extensive growth in concern with one's health (jogging, health clubs, etc.) personal appearance, and career advancement. (pp. 32–38)

Coleman argued that the loss of social capital has had profound implications for American childrearing, and in turn for the schools. Childrearing, which used to take place informally as a by-product of community activities involving the household, extended families, and neighborhood-based organizations, has "crumbled" as traditional institutions have declined. The institutions that have replaced traditional neighborhoods, such as shopping malls, cocktail parties, and rock concerts, serve as an alternative to the traditional extended family, but do not encourage an equally salient exchange of social capital between children and adults. These forces also represent realities affecting schools.

The Social Impact of Television

Along with the loss of traditional neighborhood and household structures for many children since the mid-1960s, an increased emphasis on media such as television has developed to socialize children in American culture. The argument that television has changed postwar American culture is so widely accepted that it seems almost superfluous to assert its role in creating a new ethos of schooling. A few obvious statistics may be useful, however.

In 1950, the average American owning a television watched 4 hours and 35 minutes of programming each day. By 1970 this figure had increased to 5 hours and 56 minutes, and in 1988 to 7 hours and 3 minutes. In 1960 there were 340,000 color television sets in the United States; in 1975, 48,500,000; and in 1989, 87,330,000 (Klain, 1990).

By the time the average child graduates from high school, he or she will have spent significantly more time watching television than attending school. Although television provides huge amounts of information to the individual—it is literally a window on the world—this type of knowledge differs significantly from the type traditionally promoted by the schools. Ask the average child today to identify Pecos Bill, Paul Bunyan, or Annie Oakley, and he or she will

probably not know what you are talking about, but he or she will easily identify figures such as Ronald McDonald, the Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles, and the Mighty Morphin Power Rangers.

Since its introduction, television has drawn the American people together in ways that were not possible before. In 1963, 96% of the American people watched John F. Kennedy's funeral. Ninety-four percent watched the Apollo II moon landing (Lichty, 1981). Broadcasts from Vietnam brought a distant war home almost nightly. More recently, the war in the Persian Gulf, with live coverage and almost continuous reporting, unfolded in front of viewers.

Postman (1982) described television as a total disclosure medium. In essence, "television opens secrets, makes public what has reviously been private" (p. 83). As a result, children are no longer separated from what traditionally have been adult subjects. Programs involving violence and sexuality are common fare. In addition, since the mid-1960s, subjects that previously had been taboo even for adults have become increasingly acceptable for television. Topics such as incest, rape, bisexuality, homosexuality, drug abuse, and cannibalism, which would have been censored even from adult programs 25 years ago, are now available to virtually all audiences.

If television indeed provides a window on the world, is it not logical to conclude that the experience it provides should be carried by children into the classroom? In such a case, television also provides an alternative source of knowledge and information for children, which potentially challenges the more traditional knowledge and information found in the schools.

The New Ethos of Schooling as a "More Inclusive Ethos"

Our observations thus far have led us to conclude that not only a new ethos of schooling emerged in American culture, beginning in the 1960s, but also what we choose to call a "more inclusive ethos." The factors of change identified by Cremin that we have described here, such as the various civil rights struggles, the changing character of work and households, the impact of television, the expansion of higher education, and population shifts, all have in common the inclusion of more persons and more groups in the public determination of the values by which society operates. As a result, schools are guided increasingly by values that include more and other than Protestant, White, male versions of society and schooling. We would not maintain that the earlier ethos, which we characterize as largely Protestant, White, and male, has disappeared entirely during the

past two decades, but it has been reshaped profoundly. Consequently, the ethos of schooling has changed in ways that significantly affect teachers' lives. This is true even though much of what schooling has been about since the 19th century remains constant: the bureaucratic controls and structures, the feminized nature of the occupation, the local, lay control of the schools, and so on.

THE DADE COUNTY SCHOOLS AS A BAROMETER FOR THE NATION: 1964–1984

Dade County, Florida, where we conducted our research, was affected like the rest of the country in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, by forces such as the civil rights movement, changes in household patterns, and growth in the influence of the media. Especially in the two decades between 1964 and 1984, Dade County confronted pressures involving court-ordered desegregation, local political action groups influencing education, pressures involving students' rights and freedoms, and legislated educational mandates. A review of Dade County's experience shows that it reflects nationwide pressures.

Desegregation

Issues related to desegregation were redefining the schools in Dade County, as across the nation. By 1965, 12 of the 20 senior high schools, 23 of the 35 junior high schools, and 56 of the 152 elementary schools in the county had undergone at least token integration. Integration of the faculty began on January 26, 1970, when Judge C. Clyde Atkins ordered the transfer of 2,000 teachers by February 1, 1970 to achieve uniform Black–White faculty ratios in the schools. In Dade County, as elsewhere, traditional teacher–parent–student partnerships were redefined as teachers were assigned to new schools in order to create integrated faculties. Students were reassigned as well.

Just 19 days before the 1971–1972 school year began, the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals declared the school system's desegregation plan unacceptable. Forced busing was begun, and this affected more than 66,000 pupils. In addition, school boundaries were changed in the attempt to increase racial integration.

In May 1977, Johnny Jones became the first Black superintendent of schools in Dade County. By the end of the decade, the school population had grown to 224,181 students divided almost equally among the three major racial and ethnic groups: 29.9% Black, non-

Hispanic; 33.7% Hispanic; and 35.6% White, non-Hispanic. Of the teachers, 25.6% were Black, non-Hispanic; 11.7% were Hispanic; and 62.3% were White, non-Hispanic. Many teachers, particularly the non-Hispanic Whites, found themselves teaching across racial and cultural lines.

Racial problems in Miami were exacerbated on May 17, 1980, when a Tampa jury acquitted four Miami police officers involved in the fatal shooting of Black resident Arthur McDuffie. Riots broke out in Liberty City; the public schools were forced to close as the community tried to calm down, repair the damage, and heal itself (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1982). Other racial conflicts occurred later. In January 1989, riots broke out as a result of tensions related to police violence.

Political Action Groups

Political action groups exercised various forms of influence in the Dade County Public Schools throughout the period from the mid-1960s to the mid-1980s. Blacks complained about the exclusion of African Americans from social studies and literature texts. As a result, school programs such as Black History Month and the Black History Archives were established (Provenzo & Provenzo, 1988b).

In addition to joining the national movement for bilingual education, Cuban Americans advocated Spanish proficiency as a goal of the curriculum for non-Hispanic students. The national movement focused on not penalizing Hispanic students educationally because of their native language. In contrast, Dade County parents sought inclusion of Spanish for the total population (Provenzo & Provenzo, 1988a).

Conservative religious groups also lobbied for their viewpoint. In 1977, for example, Anita Bryant brought her larger campaign against homosexuals into the schools, demanding that gay and lesbian faculty members be excluded from the teaching force in Dade County.

Student Rights and Freedom

In regard to students' rights and freedoms, Dade County experienced new student populations' need for special programs in order to realize their right to an education. The 1960s had begun with a massive immigration of Cubans fleeing from the Castro regime. Teachers with no experience with foreign students suddenly had to deal with children who could not speak English and who knew little or nothing of

American culture. By September 1970, 49,379 Spanish-speaking students were attending the Dade County Public Schools, an increase from 10.5% of the school population in 1960 to 20.7% in 1970. Cuban immigration reached a high point in 1980 with the Mariel Boatlift; at that time 120,000 new immigrants came to Florida, of whom 11,000 were school-age children (Silva, 1985). By the early 1980s, other immigrants were coming to Miami as well, including Haitians and Nicaraguans.

Other Legislated Mandates

Legislated mandates not involving desegregation were introduced into Dade County in the mid-1970s. On the national level, Congress was concerned about the availability of high-quality education for all students. The aim of the mandated programs was to meet the needs of students previously not served by American schooling. Probably the most typical congressional mandate was Public Law 94–142, passed in 1975. Under this law, schools were required to reevaluate their programs in light of special students' needs and to develop and expand those programs. On the state level, Florida enacted a basic skills testing program in 1976. In 1978 the state required a passing score for graduation from high school. In the following year, the state legislature mandated a comprehensive prescriptive program for primary (K–3) education. Testing was expanded in 1980 by a statewide assessment program. College-level performance standards were set in 1982 and high school performance standards in 1983. To close the gap between primary and secondary education, middle school performance standards were enacted in 1984. These programs reflected a move toward an increasingly performance-based educational system in which teachers were viewed as implementers of legislated policies. These trends in Florida, and in turn in Dade County, reflected larger reform movements at the national level.

Movements at work from 1964 to 1984, such as desegregation, the emergence of political action groups, increases in students' rights and freedoms, and legislated mandates represent important shifts away from the traditional ethos of schooling; they are part of the new ethos that has become more prevalent since the 1960s. As we demonstrate in subsequent chapters, other important mediating factors also play a role in the emergence of this new ethos and in teachers' experience in their work. Our purpose here, however, is to examine how strongly teachers have been affected by the changes that have occurred in American society since the 1960s.

STABILITY AND CHANGE IN TEACHERS' ATTITUDES, 1964–1984

As mentioned earlier, in addition to the interviews that form the substance of this book, our research sponsored by the National Institute of Education included a survey based on a 40% random sample of classroom teachers (N = 4,247, representing all 251 schools in the Dade County Public School system). A total of 2,718 teachers (64%) responded to the survey; the initial findings were published in the April 1986 issue of the *Phi Delta Kappan* (Kottkamp, Provenzo, & Cohn, 1986).

In the *Kappan* article we compared results from Lortie's 1964 survey of Dade County teachers with our 1984 findings. In many instances, we used Lortie's questions in 1984 to draw comparisons across the 20 years between the two studies. Our purpose was to understand how major social forces were related to shifts in teachers' attitudes and orientations toward work (Kottkamp et al., 1986c).

From a demographic perspective, the teaching population changed significantly between 1964 and 1984. Teachers were older and more experienced in 1984. In 1964, 39% of the teaching population in Dade County was over 40 years of age; in 1984, 54% of the teachers were over 40. Significant changes also had occurred in the ethnic and racial composition of the Dade County teachers. In 1964, 89% of the teachers in the school system were White; this proportion had declined to 59% in 1984. The percentage of Black teachers rose from 17% to 25% and Hispanic teachers, who were not even included in the 1964 study, made up 16% of the teachers in 1984 (Kottcamp et al., 1986c).

The educational attainments of the Dade County teachers changed significantly between 1964 and 1984. In 1964, only 25% of the teachers in the school system had a master's degree; this figure had increased to 58% in 1984.

Despite the changes in teacher demographics across the 20-year period between Lortie's research and our 1984 survey, the intrinsic rewards that teachers found most salient remained remarkably constant. In 1964, for example, 86.2% reported that the experience they found most satisfying in teaching was "The times I know I have 'reached' a student or group of students and they have learned." In 1984 this figure was 86.7%. We found a similar continuity in related items. In 1964, 76.3% of the teachers surveyed reported that the most important source of reward for them was "The opportunities to study, plan, master classroom management, 'reach' students, and associate with colleagues and children." Although this figure had declined slightly to 70.2% in 1984, its overwhelming importance to teachers is noteworthy (Kottkamp et al., 1986c).

Even though the perceived intrinsic rewards remained relatively constant, we found slight declines in teachers' levels of satisfaction about their jobs and their schools. In 1964, 81% of the teachers indicated some level of satisfaction with teaching as a job, versus 76% in 1984. In 1964, 80% expressed some level of satisfaction with their schools, versus 68% in 1984—approximately a 12% decline over the intervening 20-year period.

Over the two decades between Lortie's research and the National Institute of Education survey, the proportion of teachers who described their orientation toward teaching as "no-nonsense, get-the-learning-of-the-subject-matter-done" increased from 6% to 16%. This item, when combined with other items from the surveys reported by the two groups of teachers, suggested a shift toward developing students' rudimentary achievement in areas such as reading, writing, and mathematics, rather than using those achievements efficiently. The latter goal was considered more important by teachers in the earlier survey.

Significant changes occurred between 1964 and 1984 in the types of students that teachers indicated they preferred to teach. In 1964, 40% of the teachers surveyed stated that they were most interested in teaching "creative and intellectually demanding students who call for special effort." In 1984, only 27.9% of the respondents indicated that they were most interested in working with such students. In 1964, 36.2% of the teachers indicated that they preferred to teach "'nice kids,' from average homes, who are respectful and hard-working." This figure had increased to 46.6% in 1984.

The findings outlined here suggest that despite the extraordinary social changes over the 20 years between Lortie's survey and National Institute of Education survey, teachers' basic reasons for entering the profession have remained remarkably constant. The desire to somehow "reach" students seems to be fundamentally important to the teachers surveyed, despite changes in student populations, the demands placed on teachers, and changes in the ethos of schooling. These findings, however, also suggest that although the fundamental reasons for entering the field probably have remained constant, the rewards of the occupation have been more difficult to attain in the face of the recent changes.

THE CASE FOR STRUCTURAL STRAIN

Even though the survey data from 1964 and 1984 show remarkable stability in the rewards desired by teachers, Lortie (1986) observed the declines in teachers' satisfaction and stated:

> There is increasing tension between the qualifications and self-images of teachers in large school districts, their position in the formal system of governance, and their ability to make firm decisions in matters related to their own classrooms and students. In addition to external sources of status disruption, increased dissatisfaction, where it occurs, can be attributed to what sociologists call "structural strain." (p. 571)

Our interviews with teachers for the National Institute of Education study show repeatedly that teachers experience this strain. Although they are relatively stable in their attitudes toward the rewards and incentives provided by their occupation, teachers suffer from the pressures they face. As we show, they view the freedom, authority, and power they need to do their work as increasingly constrained. In the following chapters, by examining teachers' perceptions of their freedom, authority, and power, we examine some of the perceived effects of a changing environment. We look more closely at evidence of a new ethos of schooling and at its perceived impact on the traditional role of teachers in the United States.

2

The New Ethos of Schooling and Strains on Teachers

Inherent in Lortie's (1986) identification of a state of structural strain is a recognition that some changes occurred in the attitudes of teachers in Dade County between 1964 and 1984, despite remarkable stability. Lortie saw these changes as tensions between teachers' qualifications and their self-images, as well as between their position in the formal governance system and their ability to make firm decisions in their classrooms. As he stated, "The central issue is that experienced teachers—in Dade County, at least—are concerned about their status in school affairs" (p. 574). Although Lortie speculated about the general issue, he did not discuss the nature of that strain in detail because evidence for such strain was not apparent in the initial findings.

In subsequent analyses of the data from the interviews, we have struggled to identify the nature of this strain. Its presence in the interview data was evident to us in our earlier analyses of the phenomenon that Wise (1979) termed "legislated learning." In a retrospective discussion of his work, Wise (1988) used our analysis (McCloskey et al., 1987) to demonstrate that this phenomenon about which he had theorized not only had not diminished but had increased during the reforms of the 1980s.

The forces driving legislated learning are centralized attempts to improve educational equity and quality through state policy intervention carried out by bureaucratic, regulatory means. Wise argued that although goals such as equity in schools can be advanced by court orders, legislation, and regulatory means, it is highly unlikely that goals such as quality in education can be attained in these ways.

His reasoning is based on a belief in a discrepancy between (on one hand) the rationalistic set of assumptions constituting the theory of education, human behavior, and learning held by those who try to "legislate" learning and (on the other) the radically different realities faced by the teachers and students who inhabit the world of schools that those individuals attempt to "legislate."

In our analyses of legislated learning (McCloskey et al., 1987, 1991), we found that teachers complained regularly about the imposition of legislated mandates on teaching and about the attendant difficulties of those mandates. They said that it was more difficult to accomplish expected tasks because of the mandates. Their concerns were related to a perceived absence, in any development of the reforms, of teachers' understanding of schools and the educational process. Also, the teachers we interviewed indicated that the mandated reforms were made more difficult because of continuous, and sometimes, inconsistent changes.

Another issue for these teachers was a series of evaluation systems that seemed to implicitly question the teachers' competence and the value of veteran professionals' accumulated knowledge. In addition, teachers found that evaluation programs treated them as novices whether they were in the first, fifth, or tenth year of teaching. They felt that they would never be recognized as veteran teachers. This was an increasing problem for those who had been teaching longer. They felt that increased demonstrations of competence were useless because they never resulted in greater freedom to choose how they would work.

Finally, the teachers cited greater limits on their ability to adjust to the students' individual needs because of increased paperwork and the need to perform tasks in specific ways in order to receive favorable evaluations. Rather than being free to do what they saw as necessary, they were distracted from what they viewed as essential for teaching. Changes due to reforms and the new ethos of schooling were introducing factors into the workplace that made teaching less rewarding and less satisfying to our respondents. This point seems to us to give meaning to some of the evidence from the survey data that Lortie used to ascertain structural strain.[1] In short, rather than improving the educational environment as an incentive for teachers to be more productive and more enthusiastic in their work, legislated learning functions as a disincentive.

---

[1] The major evidence from the survey data is summarized in Kottkamp et al. (1986c), on which Lortie (1986) commented.

In reflecting on this information, we came to understand that teachers not only felt negatively about specific mandates, but also believed that their overall status was in conflict (structural strain) as a result of changes due to a changing ethos of schooling. The teachers we interviewed expressed clearly that they felt they had less status and thus less freedom, authority, and power to accomplish their classroom work.

In addition, these teachers struggled to understand the nature of the organizational structure in which they worked—that is, the ethos of schooling. Although they experienced strain and were somewhat uncertain about the sources of their difficulties, our interviewees seemed to identify areas of concern with respect to the organizational context of schooling. In earlier research (Provenzo et al., 1989), we found that teachers found means to construct and express understandings of organizational reality, particularly through metaphor, when the definitions and understandings at hand failed to provide adequate meaning. In our study of metaphor we identified some concerns that might be termed teachers' insights about the organizational context of schooling.

First, in their observations about the ongoing discussion of the purposes of schooling, teachers found themselves striving vigorously for the freedom to define a clear role for themselves in their changing classrooms. In addition, they struggled with the ambiguity of societal conflicts about teachers' authority and about support for education. As a result, they found it difficult to obtain support outside the classrooms to establish an appropriate atmosphere for learning. Finally, teachers were estranged from the discussion of the development of program objectives and evaluation of schooling, and were powerless in those processes. They felt that the development of objectives excluded them because it lacked their input, and that evaluation tended to exclude their classroom findings.

In our analysis of teachers' metaphors, teachers acted in the face of these difficulties. They were enabled to act with some sense of freedom, authority, and power by their ability to give metaphoric meaning to the situations in which they found themselves. Ricoeur called this use of metaphor "appropriation," the means of taking control of the unknown and the unexplained (cited in Reagan & Stewart, 1978, p. 91). Even though teachers were able to act, their situations contributed to the estrangement that Greene (1973) observed to be endemic in teaching. In the ambivalent hope evident in teachers' metaphors, one can observe in action Greene's comment that the teacher is "stranger, homecomer, questioner and goad to others" (p.

298). In her view, the teacher as individual, when facing critical issues, is "condemned to meaning and compelled to choose" (p. 208). Not surprisingly, Greene's (1988) later work on freedom helped us to identify differences among teachers in their struggle to teach well.

From these earlier findings, we have identified three particular metaphors that capture teachers' perceptions and clarify the structural strain they experience in an organization in the emerging new ethos of schooling. These metaphors are (a) teachers' "choice" in educational programming, arising from the struggle for *the freedom to teach* according to one's individual understanding of what it means to be a teacher within the ethos of schooling; (b) school as a "culture," arising from the struggle to exercise *the authority to teach* in the face of the ambiguities created in the shaping of a new school culture by a new ethos of schooling; and (c) "negotiating" a classroom environment, arising from the struggle for *the power to teach* because of estrangement from the forces that mandate change and create a new ethos of schooling.

Our work on legislated learning and on teachers' metaphors has shown us that teachers are struggling with issues of freedom, authority, and power. Yet in that struggle they are commenting on two things in relation to these issues: the ethos of teaching and the ethos of schooling. We devote two chapters to each of these three issues. The first chapter of each pair examines teachers' reflections on the issue as related to the ethos of teaching; the second explores teachers' reflections on the issue in relation to the new ethos of schooling. Finally, we draw conclusions based on the teachers' observations and make recommendations about realities of schoolteaching within the new ethos of schooling. Thus, to increase our understanding of the strain felt by teachers in their work, we move from the history of 1964 to 1984 and the survey data of our study into the dimensions of structural strain expressed by teachers in regard to individual teachers' freedom, authority, and power. As we examine the strains that teachers feel in relation to freedom, we find different subgroups among teachers, although they possess the same orientations and sentiments in the remarkably stable ethos of teaching.

To distinguish individual teachers' voices, we have given a pseudonym to each teacher we interviewed. We use these pseudonyms to help preserve the personal quality of the teachers' experiences. This technique also allows the readers to connect individual teachers' various insights more easily. In using pseudonyms we were influenced by the work of Gilligan (1982), where the use of pseudonyms makes the interviewee's voice clear in its presentation. Appendix B is a list of the interviewees, grouped by teacher type.

3

The Freedom to Teach

Throughout the interviews on which this study is based, teachers spoke of the limitations placed on them by society, students, parents, and the system of schooling. These limitations seemed to reduce our respondents' ability to achieve what they felt were important goals. In many respects the interviewees did not portray themselves as "free" to go about their work in ways they liked. Likewise, they did not speak of being "free"as one would expect of autonomous professionals. In this chapter we discuss what teachers would like to be free to do. The points they emphasized in their interviews, as related to freedom and autonomy, identified them as different types of teachers. In this chapter we also outline how these conceptions of freedom and teacher types help us to understand the dimensions of individualism that historically have been identified as a characteristic of the teaching occupation (Lortie, 1975).

To understand the concept of freedom in the interviews with teachers, we consulted the ideas presented by Greene (1988). After reviewing various theorists on freedom, we decided on Greene because her work reflected current discussions of freedom in itself and in relation to education and schooling.[1] According to Greene, freedom is achieved through the continued resistance to forces that limit, condition, determine, and sometimes, oppress. This approach to freedom is similar to that of our interviewees. Instead of beginning with definitions of freedom, they identified forces that kept them from ac-

[1] Among the theorists we studied were H. Arendt, J. Dewey, R.W. Emerson, M. Foucault, P. Friere, E. Fromm, R. Hare, P. Ricoeur, W.L. Rose, J.P. Sartre, and H.D. Thoreau. We felt that Greene presented an approach that included a distillation of thought from a variety of perspectives as well as paying attention to the relationship of freedom to education.

complishing their goals. In speaking of these forces, they identified the "freedom"that they struggled to achieve.

According to Greene (1988), four senses of freedom operate on the American scene: (a) a "persistent lightness of being,"(b) a sense of seeking "shelter in private enclaves or what individuals think of as interior lives,"(c) some individuals sense that they can, "assured of their own endowment, accede or strive, on their own, for 'success,' "and (d) a sense of "reaching out, along with others, toward open possibilities in experience" (p. 22). To Greene, freedom as a "persistent lightness of being" is revealed best by Milan Kundera's (1984) novel *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*. In this freedom, one is disconnected: The individual is rootless, directionless, wandering, or free from knowing what he or she wants in life.

Relying on the work of Bellah et al. (1985) Greene identified the characteristics of two other senses of freedom-seeking shelter and striving for success. In her description of seeking shelter in private enclaves, she described people who, to feel free, "build private shelters as it were, in which to take refuge from 'outer' ambiguities"(Greene, 1988, p. 20). They seek something—often something intangible—that can be protected against tampering and will enable them to function as the system expects, while remaining "free."In contrast, those who strive for success, "assured of their own endowment,"search for the freedom afforded by status. They seek a circumstance of not "having other people's values, ideas, or styles of life forced"(Bellah et al., 1985) on them, yet remaining in the mainstream.

Greene (1988) regarded the first three senses of freedom as negative because they do not "name"the obstacles they face. This lack of naming creates a closed situation. For Greene, true freedom is an open or positive value. A person experiences this freedom "each time he/she is with others—in dialogue, in teaching-learning situations, in mutual pursuit of a project—additional new perspectives open; language opens possibilities of seeing, hearing, understanding"(p. 21). In such circumstances, "each person reaches out from his/her own ground toward what might be, should be, is not yet"(p. 21).

Our analysis of the interviews, based on Greene's framework, led us to conclude that each of the teachers with whom we spoke had predominantly one of these senses of freedom. We drew this conclusion from a process beginning with each interviewee's identification of statements related to freedom. This identification was followed by an analysis, by one of the authors, of the identified "freedom"statements and the context in the transcript. We conducted this analysis separately for each transcript, and thus found that each interviewee spoke from a basic set of concerns related to one of the four types of

freedom. The other author reviewed each analysis, the findings, and the conclusions and confirmed their appropriateness.

In an earlier draft of this material we had used Greene's nomenclature for the categories. Readers of that draft found the nomenclature cumbersome and wondered whether the categories could be named more simply. It appeared in particular that "persistent lightness of being"was an awkward term for a teacher's disposition toward freedom.

In a further analysis we examined each group separately, in search of something related to teaching that they were seeking to be free to attain. In this analysis we found that each group demonstrated a distinctive focus on what was important to them in teaching. Those who can be clustered according to Greene's concept of "reaching out with others"were seeking the freedom to be student-centered (Type 1); those who "strive for their own success"seemed to be seeking the freedom of status based on subject matter (Type 2). The group of interviewees who (according to Greene's categories) "seek shelter in private enclaves"appeared to be seeking freedom to create microworlds (Type 3); those who are lost and wandering in a "persistent lightness of being"seemed to be teaching by happenstance (Type 4) and hoping that teaching would give them a freedom they could not find in other venues.

We have chosen to use the characteristics found in this later analysis as synonyms for Greene's general terms of freedom. Table 3.1 shows the numerical breakdown of interviewees according to these teacher types, as named in our later analysis.

In the following section we present the teachers' concerns about their freedom as they relate to each of the teacher types we have identified here. In this way we clarify how these varieties of teaching dispositions play out in the schools for individual teachers. We use the synonyms we have devised, as well as references to Greene's work, to show how our ideas of the teachers relate to her more general categories.

TEACHER TYPE 1: SEEKING THE FREEDOM TO BE STUDENT CENTERED

In describing the sense of freedom related to "reaching out with others,"Greene (1988) outlined freedom as openness and dialogue, a circumstance of mutual pursuit with others and the opening of possibilities of seeing, hearing, and understanding. In categorizing the teachers according to the four groups, we found that 30 of the 73

TABLE 3.1
Interviewees, by Teacher Type

	Teacher Type 1: Seeking the Freedom to Be Student-Centered	Teacher Type 2: Seeking the Freedom of Subject Matter Status	Teacher Type 3: Seeking the Freedom to Create Microworlds	Teacher Type 4: Teaching by Happenstance
Sex				
Female	24	19	5	5
Male	6	8	6	0
All	30	27	11	5
Ethnicity				
Black/Non-Hispanic	4	5	2	4
Hispanic	3	5	0	1
White/Non-Hispanic	23	17	9	0
All	30	27	11	5
Level of Teaching				
Elementary	13	8	4	5
Junior high	4	10	3	0
Senior high	13	9	4	0
All	30	27	11	5

interviewees focused on teaching as reaching out "with" people. This was the largest of the groups. In all of these interviews, the common thread was a desire to be free to center on students—that is, enjoying work with "young people,"or "kids,"as most of the respondents affectionately called them. Teaching gave them the freedom to engage in this enjoyable work.

Each of the quotes from the interviews is identified by a number assigned to each interviewee and a designation for sex, ethnicity (Black, Hispanic, White), school grade level (elementary, junior, senior), school socioeconomic level (low, medium, high), and interviewee's teaching area.

In discussing their interest in students as the primary consideration, these teachers spoke of the importance of affective learning to their students' future success. As Karen[2] stated:

> Hopefully [I] inspire students to do the best that they can do in any field, give them self-confidence, teach them respect for themselves and

[2] As noted previously, the names used here are pseudonyms to give a more personal voice to the teachers who were interviewed.

> other people because I'm interested in the community in which I live. It happens to be a very harsh community. I'd like to see it made better. These people are our future leaders. (35, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

Teachers were concerned about students functioning in society, once they left school. To avoid failure and to move on to success, Nancy felt that "a tremendous amount of self-esteem . . . has to be developed"(49, F, W, Jr/M, Soc.Stud.). Even at the earliest ages work was needed, according to Brenda, "to see them become quite independent and able to function"(11, F, W, Elem/H, Primary). The students' empowerment to function in society was of critical concern to these teachers. As Nancy also commented, "Aren't we with them all day in the formative years? What could be more important?"(49, F, W, Jr/M, Sr. Stud.).

Bette saw the affective connection to students as the only thing they would remember:

> It is students coming back that is a great reward. They'll say, "You're the only teacher that cared."How can they know? They don't ever say, "You taught me a lot of A,B,Cs."They seem to remember the interaction they had. (09, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten)

Although she emphasized academics, Bette thought that her students would remember the relational experiences. At times, however, these relational situations were a problem for Shirley, who viewed herself as too involved with her students: "I get too involved with the kids and their personal lives. . . . It's frustrating because in the end they let you down, and to me that's frustrating"(67, F, B, Sr/M, Phys.Ed.).

This focus on affective dimensions of learning relates to two aspects of the freedom that Greene (1988) called "reaching out with others."The relational descriptions are stated in terms that present the teachers as personally connected to students' learning. From their statements, we can see what Greene described as "individuals in their we-relations with others, inserting themselves in the world by means of projects"(p. 134). These "we-relations"involve a second aspect of freedom as "reaching out with others,"namely "connected teaching"or what Noddings (1984) called "care."Greene (1988) regarded connected teaching as a situation in which:

> Rather than posing dilemmas to students or presenting models of expertise, the caring teacher tries to look through students' eyes, to struggle *with* them as subjects in search of their own projects, their own ways of making sense of the world. (p. 20)

Beyond the affective, this valuing of the student as the primary concern seemed to enable these teachers to find in their students new ways of thinking and learning about their own work. For some it was as simple as adapting to students' realities. As Benjamin explained, "One of the biggest things is being able to adapt. . . . You've got to change. You've got to be able to get at the kids"(05, M, W, Elem/H, Phys.Ed.).

This freedom to adapt and change was the source of interesting vignettes from two teachers. Donald had difficulty with spelling and had made it a joint teacher–student responsibility. Students were to be as responsible for correcting him as he was for correcting them: "I have a working relationship with my kids. If they see an English word that is misspelled, they correct me. I love to have them correct me. . . . They're real good about it"(18, M, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.). Donald prided himself on instilling in his students the value of giving and receiving correction. Gloria, on the other hand, received an insight for change from a student in an experience outside the classroom:

> We used to bowl over at the Congress Bowling Alleys on Monday nights. They were telling me you have to hold the ball just so. You take two steps. You swing your arm. Whatever it was, wasn't working too well. And I hear a voice say, "Mrs. _____, you bowl like I do English."It suddenly dawned on me that I think as teachers, we don't realize. I mean we think it is easy. You know a noun from a verb. Easy, any darn fool can see a noun and a verb are not the same, but the kids don't see. This youngster was bowling 170–180, and all of a sudden he said, "You bowl like I do English."I think it made me a better English teacher. (25, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

Although working with young people was the primary concern of all these teachers, they spoke regularly about regimens that had a strong academic component. Each of these teachers emphasized the importance of subject matter. The content brought them together with their students; their relations coalesced around the project. Subject matter was the foundation of their freedom to reach out to students. It was, in short, their common ground. Yet these teachers did not necessarily see the need to be experts in subject matter. Rather, they had to be knowledgeable in ways that enabled students to enter into the subject and understand it for themselves. Oscar noted that his greatest strength was his

> ability to simplify it [subject matter] so that the students will understand it at their level . . . make sure they understand it. Go over it in two or three different ways, so that three different minds will under-

> stand it each time you explain it in a different way. You're simplifying the subject matter for them. (52, M, H, Jr/H, Gen.Math.)

These teachers' concern about students set them free to see their students and the events that took place around them in different ways. They considered it important for their students to care both about themselves and about the subjects. Nelly expressed a typical view when she said:

> What is a good day? Every kid has done their homework because they wanted to; otherwise they wouldn't do it. The kids feel good about what they have read. If they have come in feeling badly about what they have read, I turn them around. (50, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

This conception seemed to make a concrete point about Gertrude's concern. In her mind, the curriculum makers and the administrators had lost a clear sense of what schools needed to be about. They were trapped in their special, often limited, programs and were unable to develop new ways of dealing with students with learning difficulties. As Gertrude observed:

> I think a lot of administrators forget that we are teaching children. We're not teaching reading or math or social studies. We're teaching children to know these subjects and I think that makes a big difference. (24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary)

This regard for the students as the primary consideration in their work enabled these teachers to see reasons for the particular subjects that were included in the curriculum. Oscar saw his work as a teacher unfolding:

> You're molding young people's minds. You're giving them an idea. (Not much of an idea, they're there only one hour a day.) You're shaping their minds and their thought processes. You're seeing them change—become more social with society. (52, M, H, Jr/H, Gen.Math.)

In addition, when students were deficient in a skill deemed necessary for accomplishing an objective, this type of teacher was free to see other skills that could be employed to achieve the goal. Sonia believed that the emphasis on basic skills in education deprived students of the use of imagination. As she related:

> I did a unit on mythology and everybody said, "What are you crazy, trying to teach mythology to these kids? They can't even write their own

> names and this and that."Well, they may not have been able to write, but they got very interested in mythology. They're imaginative kids. They're very creative and even though they're not great with the reading and the writing, their imaginations are very active. (68, F, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

These teachers' desire to work with young people seemed not only to bring a vitality to their teaching, but also to enable them to view subject matter in new ways. Apparently this was the result of allowing students to work in different ways with the subject matter. This difference in turn empowered students to present the teachers with new insights about what they were doing.

The basic notion that teaching is directly connected to the freedom to work with new ways of thinking and learning relates to an openness that Greene (1988) considered essential to the freedom of reaching out with others. This openness is "the capacity to surpass the given and look at things as if they could be otherwise"(p. 3). Such surpassing of the given, according to the teachers cited, is an attitude of readiness for adaptation and change related to students, for seeing events and students in different ways, and for seeing students as presenting insights that instruct teachers. Such an attitude, according to Greene (1988), frees the teacher so that

> reflectiveness, even logical thinking remain important; but the *point* of cognitive development is not to gain an increasingly complete grasp of abstract principles. It is to interpret from as many vantage points as possible lived experience, the ways there are of being in the world. (p. 120)

The teachers recognized limits on this reflectiveness and on those with whom they would reach out freely. Although they respected their coworkers, teamwork was not a high priority. It was viewed as helpful primarily if students learned more. Put simply, these teachers regarded themselves as present to work with young people, not with adults. Some remarked about two circumstances of working with other teachers that they considered exciting and useful: one was team teaching, the other a school-based reform program.

Paula believed that team teaching stretched her ability to teach, which in turn benefited her students. As she described her teammates:

> The one teacher that I mentioned before, the highly professional one, some of the things that she did with the children academically impressed me. I took that knowledge or that observation and fit it into my framework, into my personality. I was never exposed to that kind

> of teaching and it impressed me. Then my other teammate, her flexibility has helped me tremendously. (56, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten)

The school-based reform program appealed to Kelly:

> The best I've heard would be where a whole school might get together and decide the [plan for a] merit school. There I think you could, because there it is the whole school raising itself from what it was the previous year. (36, F, W, Elem/L, Spec.Ed./L.D.)

The teachers, however, seemed less tolerant of peers than of students who presented difficulties. Karen described her concerns about the same school-based reform program:

> A teacher who maybe is weak, or the word that's used at school, your metaphor, is sort of like a leech. It's like sucking up, sucking up your information, your creativity, your work. Teaching is a profession where the kids do that all day and you have to have a lot of patience because it is a giving profession. There just doesn't seem to be too much left over for the other teachers. Most teachers, especially at my school I think, resent that. The gist at my school is sharing everything to bring up the weaker teacher. (35, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

Working with other teachers was rewarding only if assistance helped them to be better teachers. If energy was wasted in such relationships, however, these teachers felt less free in what they could do with students.

This downplaying of other teachers' importance reflects a closing off of alternative sources of understanding. Such a limitation demonstrates one of the paradoxical elements in the freedom of reaching out with others: The choice of one arena for openness may entail the closing off of another. As Greene (1988) observed:

> The person who chooses himself/herself in his/her freedom cannot place the onus on outside forces, on the cause and effect nexus. It is his/her interpretation or reading of the situation that discloses possibility; and yet there is no guarantee that the interpretation is correct. If there is proof to be found, it is only in the action undertaken; and the action itself closes off alternatives. There is a[ways, as in the Robert Frost poem, a "road not taken."(p. 5)

Among the teachers we interviewed, the distractions created by other teachers were only a minor source of the interference that they found in their teaching. The teachers who sought the freedom to

work with young people portrayed themselves as needing a work environment where they could create rapport. To all of them, this seemed currently to be a fragile commodity in the schools. They may have identified different types of interference, but they all viewed interference as at least a semiregular occurrence. Some considered it the mark of a bad day. A bad day for Paula, for example, was a day when things were

> . . . out of your control. There's been a change in schedule, such as the ESOL teacher is absent today. You have to cancel your plans. General interference that—a bad day is interference—that I have no control over. (56, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten)

Some teachers saw paperwork as a burden[3] that limited their ability to do more important work. They considered themselves forced to be documenters and bookkeepers rather than teachers. In Patricia's words:

> I know that we taught everything we had to teach in the day. It got in there somehow, but we didn't have anybody breathing on our necks where we had to document how many minutes we spent on what. I think that's ridiculous. It puts too much pressure on teachers. . . . In the elementary level you have check—Johnny can do this, Johnny can do that. The teacher is involved in so much bookkeeping that she can no longer teach. (55, F, W, Sr/L, Spec.Ed./V.E.)

Bookkeeping and excessive paperwork seemed to be compounded by problems of a changing curriculum. Teachers felt that they were subject to conflicting expectations, so that it was difficult to respond adequately to the demands that were placed on them. Further, keeping up with changing administrative expectations took attention away from the students, who were their main reason for being teachers. The teachers were more than distracted; at times they seemed to be derailed. Victoria complained about

> the inconsistency of administration procedures, the inconsistency of curriculum changes. I mean in the department that I'm working, one day they are telling you to teach kids this. The next day they are saying do that. The next day it is something else. (71, F, B, Sr/M, Spec.Ed./L.D.)

These teachers seemed to be frustrated by programs the administration presented as organized but that were inconsistent or unclear.

---

[3] The issue of paperwork is discussed more comprehensively in McCloskey et al. (1987).

More important, they felt that they were in a bind because they would be evaluated on how effectively they implemented programs that often seemed to make little sense. Accountability had become a code word: Teachers were held accountable for things they had little influence in developing and things they believed were of questionable value. Evaluations, in their opinion, could be good, but in their experience, it was more often political than informational or useful. In some cases the very word *accountability* had undermined their confidence when it was presented as the reason for doing a particular type of work. Accountability seemed to be related more to politics than to evaluation, associated more with episodic, one-shot programs than with consistent quality control or improvement. As Gloria said:

> Now they have made us accountable. We have to know what we are going to do, when we are going to do it, and what hour we are going to do it. Now they have thrown this T.A.D.S. [Evaluation] at us where somebody is going to come into the classroom and tell us what we are doing right and what we are doing wrong. Teachers who have been teaching 15 to 20 years are trembling. Literally trembling that somebody is going to walk in at the wrong time. You can be doing everything right, and suddenly somebody is going to walk in when everything is wrong. (25, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

These teachers would have felt freer if they had been left alone. Yet they did not wish to be left alone simply to be isolated, but rather to work together with their students on the task of learning. Sonia recalled that this desire dated back to her student teaching days: "The best days that I had were when she [the supervising teacher] left me alone and I developed a very close relationship with the kids. . . . I'm not talking about being buddies. I'm talking about being people"(68, F, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts/Eng.).

The difficulties with interferences, especially those related to accountability, seemed to have a personal dimension. For teachers in this group, the interferences were "a personal challenge, . . . an obstacle"(Greene, 1988, p. 6). According to Greene, this obstacle "becomes such only to those risking free choice"(p. 6) connected to reaching out with others. Such a personalizing of the struggle may reflect a fundamental difficulty in the purpose of the bookkeeping, administration, and accountability. This is not surprising because, as Greene (1988) observed, "The language of contemporary schooling and, indeed, of proposed reforms emphasizes something quite different"(pp. 6–7) from a freedom that reaches out to others.

Yet because these teachers' reactions seem to be based on intuition, sometimes rather than on fact, their interpretations can be problematic. The success in being free in reaching out with others is based not only on interpreting from intuition but also, according to Greene (1988), on individuals' ability "to *name* the obstacles that stand in their way"(p. 5). Are bookkeeping, administration, and accountability the right names for the obstacles that these teachers face, or are they symptoms of other realities? Merely surmounting symptoms will not result in the freedom from obstacles these teachers desire.

It seemed that although these teachers focused on relating to their students, they saw increasing constraints on the freedom they needed to do their job effectively. Students did not always respond well. At other times, concerns about accountability distracted the teachers. To be sure, even though these teachers were free and open to new possibilities with students, they still regarded their students as children and did not accord them the freedom to act that might be given to other adults. They were more open than other teachers to the idea of students' directing their own learning, but they still held the rather conservative expectation that students would become full, active members of society.

These teachers wished to be free to respond to possibilities that might emerge from working together with their students on the project of learning. The work they did, however, and where they did it, imposed built-in limits on that openness. The teachers seemed to accept these limits and even were fairly happy with them. Although they might prefer smaller classes, they wanted to work with groups of students, not with individuals. The individuals they worked with were not free to disrupt the good of the group. Teachers might be concerned about their students' development, but in the end the students were not at liberty to ignore or disregard academic standards. These students were being educated to explore possibilities, but were not free to create a new society. Their instruction was intended to teach them to act responsibly in society as it currently existed.

These teachers, who had difficulty with some of the structural constraints on teaching, had not considered the fact that the society that was constraining their freedom to work with young people was the same society that they were schooling students to join, not to change. These conflicts were unresolved and largely unrecognized by the teachers in this group. This lack of resolution in fact may point up a conflict for the teacher seeking the freedom to be student-centered, as related to his or her desire for the freedom of reaching out with others. According to Greene (1988), in regard to this use of the term

freedom, "The point is not that there are never any excuses; it is that, in classrooms, as well as in the open world, accommodations come too easily"(p. 5).

TEACHER TYPE 2: SEEKING THE FREEDOM OF SUBJECT MATTER STATUS

In describing the sense of freedom that was related to an individualism whereby people strove for success, Greene thought that such freedom emanated from an assurance that the people involved had some personal or individual endowment or quality that would result in success or status. Believing in themselves, such people are concerned that other people's values, ideas, or lifestyles may be forced on them. Although teachers of this type were individualistic, they presented themselves as part of the core, normal, or mainstream type of teacher. This was the second largest of the groups: 27 of the interviewees belonged to this type.

In addition to their evident individualism with respect to teaching, the common thread that appeared in these interviews was a desire for the freedom of subject matter status. These teachers often identified this concern as the first characteristic or skill necessary for successful teaching. According to Harry, "A person would have to know his subject matter, be an authority on his subject, and be able to relate what he has been taught in college and apply it to his students"(29, M, B, Sr/M, Soc.Stud./Civ./Gov.). This status based on subject matter enabled teachers to function better; it gave them a liberating confidence. As Linda saw the contribution of subject matter, "It's mainly a feeling of confidence. When you know what you're talking about, you feel secure in what you're talking about. It's imparted to the students"(38, F, W, Sr/L, Fine Arts/Art). Agnes considered dedication important, but believed that a focus on subject matter was the crucial dimension to being a good teacher. Good teachers, she said, are not "just good dedicated people, but . . . in terms of their subject matter, they are good"(04, F, B, Jr/L, Lang. Arts/Eng.).

Subject matter was not viewed in isolation; the young people to whom it was taught were definitely a concern for these teachers. The young people, however, were secondary. To make the freedom of subject matter status a reality in learning, Bonnie said, "you need the knowledge of your subject. You need a sense of humor to get along with the kids"(10, F, W, Sr/M, Soc.Stud./His.). These teachers felt that their importance lay in bringing subject matter to the student; any limits on such subject matter was a constraint on reaching students.

Another constraint on these teachers was the fact that students did not accord subject matter the same status as did the teachers. As Mark reflected on his initial experience in teaching:

> I was greatly disappointed in the fact that students didn't love the subject the way that I did, that social studies was a horrendous undertaking for a lot of them. It was a thing that they were compelled to take. So there wasn't the taste for it that somehow I expected that they would have, as I had had. (42, M, W, Sr/H, Soc.Stud.)

These teachers viewed their students through the lens of subject matter.

Four of these teachers mentioned freedom, in relation to teaching, as a concern. In her dealings with her principal, Audrey appreciated information about what was going on, "but it's nice to know you have freedom in your room, too"(06, F, H, Elem/M, Spec.Ed./Vis.). Not all the teachers regarded themselves as free, however, even in their classrooms; they referred to a constrained freedom. According to John, another of these four, "I think we have freedom to teach as long as we stay on the subject"(31, M, W, Jr/L, Gen.Sci.). One teacher might think that the subject was a constraint, but to another whose primary focus was teaching subject matter, this was the desired freedom.

Reforms in education, new regulations, and a stress on accountability had made the other two teachers of this group, who used the word *freedom* in their interviews, feel that the desired freedom had been diminished. Garry perceived less freedom in terms of what he taught and how he taught it. He commented, "Sometimes losing control is good. Sometimes it's not"(23, M, W, Jr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.). Teachers, in his view, knew what subject matter the students could grasp and what curriculum the teachers needed to convey the subject matter. Meeting objectives was good only if those objectives were realistic and if teachers could receive feedback in curriculum development in order to develop realistic objectives from the mandates. As Bridget observed about a similar situation, "Everything is mandated to you. You have no freedom to venture out"(12, F, B, Elem/H, 2nd). The "venturing out"she wanted was the use of alternative materials to deliver subject matter and to pursue ideas beyond the levels mandated. Yet because she had to meet schedules and cover everything prescribed, nothing else could be included.

Like these four interviewees who used the term *freedom*, the other teachers in this category conveyed an impression of an inner character or understanding that would guide them in good practice. Their

knowledge of subject matter was connected somehow to this trait. Thus they could strive for success in teaching on the basis of a personal endowment, supported by their knowledge of subject matter. They expected to be free to rely on themselves. When asked what advice she would give to new teachers, Cecilia, who had been teaching only a few years, said she would tell them to "depend on yourself. You have to have the motivation and the drive to want to reach those goals that you're looking forward to, the ones that you've worked for so long"(14, F, B, Elem/M, 3rd). In one of Cecilia's colleagues, this self-assurance was even greater; it extended to accountability. When asked to whom he was accountable, William responded, "Number one is to myself. if I am not comfortable with myself teaching one particular thing, or any method of teaching or discipline, any particular area, I can't do it"(73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./Health).

This freedom to rely on oneself enabled these teachers even to view teaching style as an individualistic endeavor, as long as subject matter was covered. To George, it was simply "very individualistic. Each instructor has his technique, and his personality comes through.... Each instructor more or less does what he or she feels is the best way to bring these points across"(22, M, H, Sr/M, Phys.Ed./Dri.Ed.).

The freedom to be an individual was evident even in working and planning with other teachers. Reflecting on a group project, Agnes observed:

> Working together, we were able to develop things like a writing program, able to develop a leadership program. Everybody pooled ideas. I've gotten some good ideas from that. But in ... the practical sense, you alone can make it work for you. (04, F, B, Jr/L, Lang. Arts/Eng.)

These teachers cared most about conveying subject matter. They had no need to go out and look anywhere else. In Albert's words, "It's just self-satisfying"(02, M, H, Sr/H, Phys.Ed.).

Even though this type of teacher displayed freedom to rely on themselves, students were obviously important. Even so, they were, as stated earlier, a secondary concern. Interestingly, these teachers did not seem to extend to students the same level of freedom to be an individual that they accorded themselves. Students had to demonstrate interest in the subject matter before receiving freedom. This attitude fits the teachers' conception of themselves: they had demonstrated interest and mastery, and thus could be free to act on their own.

In relation to students, these teachers always focused on working on subject matter. For Audrey, even rapport with students was a fac-

tor in work. As she described her classroom, "One of the things I strive for is to have a real good rapport with the kids, be able to offer them a classroom where they feel at ease to work"(06, F, H, Elem/M, Spec.Ed./Vis.). This focus seemed to come from a belief that although one might have an innate ability or talent, one had to work to bring it out; it did not emerge naturally. As Francine said, "You're not born knowing how to learn"(20, F, W, Elem/H, 2nd). Students might learn throughout their lives, but to do it well and consistently, they needed to learn how to learn. Teachers had to be there to help them in this.

Because students did not naturally work on learning, these teachers found, it was necessary to limit the students' interaction in the classroom. They often referred to doing the work as "being on task."For Deborah, this factor helped to determine what a good day was. As she related, "The kids are really on task and you can laugh with them and not lose control of the class. I mean, I have some classes in which you can do that and some classes you can't"(17, F, W, Elem/L, 4th). Bonnie, a high school teacher, reflected that the need to be on task and yet to be able to relate personally was particularly difficult with some of her students, who had been turned off to school. In her experience:

> What's difficult is that there's that fine line. Either I'm serious or I like to joke around a lot. If I do, they get out of control. That kind of student can't handle that kind of repartee, and so then they go off. So that's a fine line and it's difficult. (10, F, W, Sr/M, Soc.Stud./His.)

At least one of the teachers, Linda, felt free to bypass these difficult students and focus on those who were interested in the subject. In her classroom:

> You're trying to get objectives across and they're just not responding. So you have to realize that this is their problem. You just try and forge ahead. If they're not receptive to the idea, you try to reach the students that are. (38, F, W, Sr/L, Fine Arts/Art)

In sum, the teachers who were seeking the freedom of subject matter status felt free to work with students on the basis of subject knowledge, and to accept or reject input, observation, or evaluation. They had a strength and self-assurance based on inner freedom, which enabled them to stand as individuals as well as participating in the system of schooling. Those who worked with them would always know that these individuals were sure of what they were doing and felt free to express their vision.

TEACHER TYPE 3: SEEKING THE FREEDOM TO CREATE MICROWORLDS

One group of teachers fit Greene's description of persons who focused on freedom by seeking a shelter, or a private enclave in which to take refuge from "outer"ambiguities. In this group we found people who sought the freedom to create microworlds, so to speak, in which they could function best. These people sought to protect their work against tampering. They did so in the hope of functioning sufficiently in keeping with the expectations of the system, and yet remaining "free."The 11 interviewees in this category felt that they knew the circumstances in which they worked best and believed they should be left to do that. In the words of Peter, a teacher who experienced such freedom, "They allow me to do my job. That's one thing I like. I like . . . when they kind of leave me alone. I think I work best like that"(54, M, B, Sr/L, Fine Arts/Music).

Sometimes the freedom to block out the ambiguities or close the classroom door against interference came from the belief that those who were interfering did not understand what they criticized. Leo complained about parents' interference in his teaching: "The people in this community are not educated. Where in the hell do they come and tell us how to teach?"(37, M, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts). Although this observation was isolated, it was consistent with the general idea held by this type of teacher: Other people who did not know what they were doing interfered with their work.

Leo's concern may have come from his lack of a coping skill that 9 of the 11 persons in this category felt they possessed. Harriet stated frankly, "I bend the rules and regulations. I prefer them not to be so stringent"(26, F, W, Elem/L, 4th). She coped by making the classroom her own world. She emphasized the subjects she knew and liked best, and gave only the necessary coverage to the other subjects. Harriet said she regarded the system, and even the people working in it, as absurd. As a result she limited her association with other teachers, which she described in part as follows:

> I walk into the teachers' lounge. They think I'm crazy. I walk in, sit down, and they're up and complaining up a storm. I get up. I walk out. I can't even sit there. I would rather eat lunch with my kids. Not for the 20 minutes, just so that I don't have to eat with these people. (26, F, W, Elem/L, 4th)

She felt free when she limited her interaction with her peers.

Diane, another of the nine teachers who claimed special coping skills, saw that her life had become more difficult because of the recent pressures for greater accountability in the classroom. She remembered a time when she felt she could complete the schoolwork in the morning and do special things in the afternoon:

> All morning long we would do the phonics lesson and everything that was expected of us in the progression plan, but in the afternoon I was sneaky. I had a signal, just like they do with baseball players . . . whenever the principal was coming, we'd act very, very sweet and very good and quiet. You see, I like children usually better than adults. I love to have fun with them so we could sing and dance. I did lessons with the great composers. These little children that never knew anything, they would know the finest composers. They would know Bach when they heard it. They would know Beethoven and they would also know the latest in jazz. . . . I taught them how to look at things and how to draw, and it was very interesting. We had a wonderful time in the afternoons as well as the mornings. (19, F, W, Elem/H, 3rd)

Diane reported that her students had always done well on standardized tests. Even so, she had increasingly felt the need to withdraw into her enclave in order to teach freely since the "boxes"and "kits"of systems learning had begun to appear.

> The change came immediately when I saw those boxes. There were boxes, and then—it's just like a Chinese puzzle. When you finish one box there's another box inside the box, and then the box goes within the box. There's boxes 'til you die. (19, F, W, Elem/H, 3rd)

Escaping from the boxes was a move to freedom, just as it was for Pete Seeger when he sang "Little Boxes"in the 1960s.

Harriet and Diane, however, were extreme in their special coping skills. The other seven teachers in this group of nine had developed microworlds in regularly recognized classroom activities and work. Two emphasized the satisfaction of coaching because it enabled them to face the travails of teaching. One isolated himself as a physical education instructor; another was a school band director. The other three focused on library work, a video production center, and a yearbook. In an earlier analysis of these data, Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn (1986b) focused on three of these interviewees as possibly evidencing a mid-career reappraisal phenomenon. Among the 11, those three seem to us to be a more general type, with certain possible features peculiar to midcareer.

The microworld or enclave for each of these teachers sheltered and protected them by providing a special environment. They were free to act on that basis. This situation was best exemplified by Richard; when he was asked when he decided to become a teacher, the conversation quickly turned to his desire to be a coach, the teaching environment in which he operated:

> Basically I think around junior high. I think at that point certain teachers like to leave an impression on a person's life—like mine. At that point I was starting to get into athletics, where a coach may have been an influence. So it was probably then that I decided that I wanted to direct kids' lives by coaching. (60, M, W, Elem/L, Phys.Ed.)

Stanley, on the other hand, seized the opportunity to create a video production center in his school. In that situation he had the freedom to act in ways that he recognized were unavailable to his colleagues:

> The principal has implicit trust in me. I can make any kind of project. I can demand anything. Anything that I want is mine, and that's a very nice feeling. I mean I don't have any real restrictions on me. I don't have the usual restrictions of the classroom teacher. (65, M, W, Jr/H, Sci.Bio.)

As a result of this special freedom, Stanley could not envision being a teacher who simply taught science classes every period.

As yearbook moderator, Alice had found a niche in which she enjoyed enough freedom to cope with her other experiences. She said she paid a price for that luxury, however:

> My kids were—for the office—putting stuff in the teachers' mailboxes, and one of the teachers resented the fact that my kids had so many privileges. They're special kids. They're privileged because they do so much for the school. Nobody's allowed in the teachers' mailbox room, and the teacher was very nasty to my kids and shoved them out. She must have thought they were doing something for the principal, but she knew they were my kids. She called me up in front of the union and I pulled her out on harassment charges. She harassed the children. She was nasty to them, and those kids were doing a service for the school. She won't hear it. So I get those privileges, but I pay for them. I really pay for them. There are very, very few teachers that I can socialize with. (01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.)

The microworld that freed also seemed to isolate. It illuminated the lack of freedom outside of the microworld. None of these teachers had seemed able to resolve this paradox.

In this group, we were struck by the preponderance of males. In an overall sample in which 27.4% of the respondents were men, this type had a male component of 55.55%. One noteworthy fact about these men was that four of the six came to teaching as a second career. When the first career ended, teaching seemed to be a good, secure alternative. We were not surprised that people who did not enter teaching to be teachers, but rather for secure jobs, needed an alternative within the professional setting to secure their freedom.

Overall this group of 11 teachers (15.07% of all interviewees) seemed very much out of the mainstream. The first two types accounted for 78.08% of the teachers we interviewed. These eleven sought to close their doors against inspection. They saw themselves not so much as run-of-the-mill teachers, but as people with special places in which to work. Those special places were of their own determination; their work did not correspond to the needs of students or the subject matter.

TEACHER TYPE 4: TEACHING BY HAPPENSTANCE

The last of the freedom categories that we found among our respondents was described by Greene as having a "persistent lightness of being."As we pointed out earlier, this was the condition of being rootless, directionless, or wandering, or not really knowing what one wanted. Among the teachers we interviewed in the research for this study, five (6.85%) seemed lost and wandering, in search of how and what to teach. All of these individuals entered teaching through a "lucky"break. They were substitutes or teacher aides who started by filling in during a crisis or in a special need. In reality they were teaching, by their own admission, purely by happenstance.

Their lack of planning and reason for teaching was clearly evident in their struggle to teach. Classroom management problems were the most noticeable characteristic of their experience. Even though many other teachers said that students presented discipline problems, these five teachers seemed overwhelmed by their circumstances and by the need to gain greater control over the classroom. They did not have the freedom within themselves to establish discipline and order. Four of them considered the principal a necessary part of their management structure. As Rita observed, "It depends on the principal and what she wants"(58, F, B, Elem/L, Kindergarten). These four said that they experienced freedom to teach when a principal had

been a regular part of the classroom management process. As Rita described the situation,

> The first principal—she was very strict. All the kids had to do was to see her and that was it. They would settle down. She would come in and talk to the kids and tell them the teacher's in charge, and this and that. This particular principal that I have now is not like that. (58, F, B, Elem/L, Kindergarten)

Maria had taught previously in another school and was encountering difficulties with her current principal. She remembered the first school as follows:

> Beautiful—I loved it—the principal and everything. She just had her school together. You had no discipline problems because she said, "How could you teach with discipline problems?"That was true. She just handled everything. She would come in one day a week and pick up your plan book and teach. She was good. (43, F, B, Elem/M, 4th)

Martha singled out parents as the main source of the problem. As she said, "What can we do if the parents do not agree with the teachers? What can the teachers do?"(44, F, H, Elem/M, 3rd). For her a good day was one on which all the students had turned in homework and did not act up much. Martha seemed to lack freedom whenever her students or their parents decided to take it away from her.

These teachers, caught in the happenstance of the moment, seemed unable to find a structure or an order that they could bring to their classrooms to free themselves for the business of teaching. They expected the students to bring their discipline from home to school; or failing that, they expected the system to impose that structure via the principal. When neither of these two forces operated, these teachers were at a loss and seemed to be trapped.

For Sandra, at least, the aimlessness was a larger concern. She needed some authority figure to take her problems to in order to work them out successfully. As she described a relationship with a former teacher, "If I had a little problem, I would go to him and talk about it and everything would be all right. Even as an adult you need something to hold on to. You need an anchor"(63, F, B, Elem/H, Spec.Ed./V.E.). Sandra believed she would be free to teach when her anchor made everything all right.

All of the teachers in this category were ethnic or racial minority women. This fact concerned us because it raised the question of racial stereotyping. We believe that the concepts of freedom and the

resulting teacher types we use here do not have a racial bias. In this belief, we reviewed the interviews for elements common to these women. As noted earlier, all five had worked as teacher aides or substitute teachers before they were hired full time. More important, all of these hirings were related to emergencies in which a vacancy had to be filled because of another teacher's illness or abrupt departure from a school. Happenstance made it seem that these teachers were in the right place at the right time, but for the wrong job. Other studies (Cohn, Kottkamp, McCloskey, & Provenzo, 1987; see also Cohn & Kottkamp, 1993; Cohn Kottkamp, & Provenzo, 1986b) identified some of these teachers as demonstrating deCharms' (1968) notion of "pawn" versus "origin" behavior. Origin behavior was considered essential for good teaching. We believe that the crisis element in these teachers' hirings should be considered; therefore they not only resemble pawns but are in the occupation only by chance.

One troubling aspect of these women's careers was that four of the five expressed concerns that their current principal would push them out. It seemed that in the short term they were hired to fill in because a body was needed, but in the long term they were not viewed as appropriate teachers. Could they be removed easily because they were minority women? In such a case, would they have anyone to fight on their behalf?

Another troubling feature of this situation was that these women were working predominantly with at-risk and learning-disabled children. It seemed to be a case of lost teachers for lost children. These teachers, who apparently could not find the ability to teach, seemed hardly able to convey to these students a sense of learning to enable them to move beyond their own difficulties.

Even though these women may represent only 6.85% of our interviewees, it seemed that the happenstance that made them teachers, when combined with the cycle of failure that they described as their students' experience, was an unbearably high price for reactive staffing decisions.

THE FREEDOM TO "REACH"YOUNG PEOPLE

Across all the categories we found a preponderance of concern about "reaching students."Teachers seeking the freedom to be student-centered (Type 1) spoke of their desire to reach students. Teachers seeking the freedom of subject matter status (Type 2) tried to reach students through their knowledge of the subject; teachers seeking freedom to create microworlds (Type 3) used the enclave to reach students. Happenstance teachers (Type 4) wanted to reach students but

seemed unable to do so. From this perspective, we could say that the teachers generally desired the freedom to reach young people. This desire was confirmed in the survey data that we collected for this research as well as in the earlier work by Lortie. As Table 3.2 shows, 86.2% of the teachers in 1964 and 86.7% in 1984 cited "the times I know I have 'reached' a student or group of students and they have learned"as the most satisfying intrinsic reward in teaching.

Although we found this overwhelming desire to reach students, the different teacher types identified here demonstrate a variety of notions about what is meant by "reaching"students. Yet it could be misleading to speak of distinct and unrelated notions because there appears to be a spectrum among Type 1 and Type 2 teachers, with low concern for subject matter and high concern for students at one end and high concern for subject matter and low concern for students at the other. In this regard, "reaching"students is a relative term. Even though many teachers agreed with the statement, as shown by the high percentages over time, it might be appropriate to leave the word "reach" in quotation marks. Such a distinction highlights the fact that these teachers brought their own meaning to "reaching."

Mark captured the sense of the teachers' range of meaning for "reaching"students when he observed:

> I think it varies with personalities. I think some people get away with less knowledge and more emphasis on attitudes/personalities, and can pull it off. I personally am a strong proponent of knowledge. I think a person has to know a great deal before he can, as one of my old professors used to like to say, simplify something and still make it true, still make it adhere to the factual situation. (42, M, W, Sr/H, Soc.Stud.)

TABLE 3.2
The Intrinsic Rewards Most Satisfying to Dade County Teachers

	1964 %	1984 %
The opportunity that teaching gives me to study, read, and plan for classes	3.4	1.9
The chance that teaching offers to develop mastery of discipline and classroom management	1.1	1.4
The times I know I have "reached" a student or group of students and they have learned	86.2	86.7
The chance to associate with children or young people and to develop relationships with them	7.9	7.6
The chance that teaching gives me to associate with other teachers and educators	1.0	.7
I receive no satisfaction from these	.3	1.6

Note. From Kottkamp et al. (1986c).

Yet when the teachers exercised the freedom to locate themselves in different places on the spectrum, their teaching styles were not necessarily understood by other teachers. Mark, a Type 2 Teacher, described the typical teacher in Type 1 as "getting away"with less knowledge. Although the goal of "reaching"young people united the teachers, they were separated by the techniques and styles they used to do so. This may explain why some of the teachers did not regard others as doing a good job, or considered them to be burnt out. Those other teachers were not doing the same things from the same perspective. Teachers who do not operate from exactly the same perspective might be those whom Cohn (Cohn, McCloskey, Kottkamp, & Provenzo, 1988; see also Cohn & Kottkamp, 1993) singled out as working only for a paycheck.

Although "reaching"might be a relative term, the teachers as a group repeatedly cited working with students as an important focus of their work, even if not always the primary goal. These teachers were not seeking to increase their interaction with other adults—that is, other teachers or administrators (Cohn et al., 1988). Recent reform efforts have expressed concerns about career ladders and professionalization. In some cases, these proposals have focused on lightening teachers burdens resulting from the classroom by reducing their contact with students and increasing their contact with other adults through curriculum development and mentoring. If there is any truth to teachers' expressed desire for greater freedom to work with young people, these proposals will not free teachers but will constrain them further.

Career ladders and professionalization should free teachers to work more with students, with fewer of the burdens of paperwork and the like that keep them on a level with beginning teachers. Teacher aides, secretarial assistance, and even less frequent evaluation may be more satisfying to teachers than reduced time in the classroom. Some of the proposals in this area make one wonder whether they are not designed to satisfy those who have left the classroom for administration or full-time union work, rather than those who remain freely in the classroom to "reach"young people.

STRAINS ON THE STABILITY OF THE ETHOS OF TEACHING

All the teachers we interviewed expressed concern about having less freedom than they would like, and about a struggle to express their individuality and autonomy as teaching professionals. Our respon-

dents observed that controls from various sources impeded their implementation of freedom to teach, as they understood it. This factor seemed to be important when teachers regarded teaching as a profession or as an art. As Lortie (1969) observed:

> Elementary teaching is a case in point. The role of the elementary teacher is defined in diverse and contradictory terms. As an "employee," the teacher is a salaried worker subject to the authority of a public body which employs her. Continual claims to "professional" status presume the existence of a unified occupational group with a system of collegial controls. The rhetoric of "teaching as an art," however, projects autonomy rather than control; to use the artist as prototype is to stress individuality rather than standardization through bureaucratic or collegial controls. (p. 5)

According to these definitions, the teachers felt that they were less free, less autonomous, and more like mere employees than like independent professionals or artists and craftworkers.

The critical aspect of this feeling seemed to us to involve the impact of the changing ethos of schooling. Teachers were finding that the young people with whom they worked, as well as their administrative superiors, were making increasingly difficult demands on them—demands that were either new or unexpected. Because the teachers wished to work with young people, new types of students surely would affect their perceptions. New immigrants or mainstreamed disabled students presented new challenges. These challenges, however, were not the same for all teachers. For those who were seeking the freedom to be student-centered teachers, such students presented a more complex situation of classroom interactions. For the teachers who were seeking the freedom of subject matter status, the subject matter to be taught became more problematic because different types of students increased the variety of problems in achieving mastery. Those who sought the freedom to create microworlds found those microworlds more fragile. Those who were teaching by happenstance simply became more lost in an increasingly complex experience.

Teachers also were experiencing greater demands from the public and in turn from their superiors in the workplace. The new ethos of schooling took the form of new curricula in subjects such as child abuse and sex education. The new ethos was demanding that more types of children succeed in schooling than ever before. Again, for those teachers who sought freedom of subject matter status, more and more subject matter was being added with no rethinking of the

aims and purposes of the curriculum. In addition, these teachers were satisfied with the traditional curriculum and thought this new material was intrusive. For the teachers who sought the freedom to be student-centered, the schools had not reflected sufficiently on the complexity that results from introducing new mixes of people into the schooling process. Despite their belief in the need for desegregation, these teachers felt that the older condition of schooling had its values and that the newer one sometimes was adrift. Conflict with the larger world of schooling had become more regular for those teachers who sought to create microworlds. Their enclaves were less and less able to fend off the demands of society. Finally, for those who were teaching by happenstance, who were wandering and lost, this confusing set of societal demands had gone further out of control.

The teachers we interviewed did not perceive themselves as free. Even though a strong majority (those in Types 1 and 2) seemed to have enough latitude to accomplish their work, they still viewed themselves more as workers than as professionals or artists and craftworkers. This conflict, we believe, did not result simply from a changing student population and evolving societal demands. At least two factors in the socialization into schoolteaching influenced the teachers' feeling that they were less free to do their work. Lortie (1975), in his study of teachers in the 1960s, identified these factors in "Two general facilitators: 'The Wide Decision Range' and 'The Subjective Warrant.' "These facilitators are reinforced by a third factor, which Lortie termed the orientation to individualism.

The wide decision range and the subjective warrant are part of the eased entry that characterizes teaching as an occupation. Whatever one may believe philosophically, teachers in Type 4 could have come this far in an occupation only because of the phenomenon of eased entry. It seems, however, that these teachers' dispositions, which were reinforced by eased entry at the beginning of the teaching career, developed into strong expectations later in the career. As demonstrated earlier, our research was based on an older, more experienced group of teachers than Lortie studied originally; yet these factors still seemed to operate.

Strains Resulting From the Wide Decision Range

In Lortie's conception, the wide decision range refers to teachers' great visibility to young people as members of an occupation. This allows a long period for deciding whether and how to enter the occupation. The result is a heterogeneity in entries, which the interviews

for this study confirmed. More important, the long decision period allows for significant amounts of self-selection into the occupation: "The motivations, orientations, and interests candidates bring are not systematically assessed to eliminate those whose characteristics fail to fit a particular model"(Lortie, 1975, p. 39).

This lack of early assessment seemed to give our interviewees the impression that it was difficult to systematically assess the ability to teach. Because teachers should be free to do what was right, every teacher had to discover independently what was right for them. Accountability through assessment evaluations created problems. Because teacher Types 3 and 4, in their microworlds and happenstance situations, lacked connection to the system as a whole, they could not understand what was being assessed; often they viewed evaluation as a way to "get" them. Type 2 teachers, in their desire for freedom to teach subject matter, were concerned that extraneous material would be the subject of the assessment and that the important material would be relegated to a secondary position. These teachers were concerned about the possibility that what they had decided was good teaching might not be wanted by the schools.

Type 1 teachers, who wanted to be free to be student-centered, did not understand how the quality of interaction in the school could be assessed accurately. When they discussed subject matter they were concerned that the evaluation would recommend that they cover subject matter that the students did not need and that the teachers did not wish to teach.

The teachers' concerns about the freedom to teach were pervaded by the feeling that their decision to become teachers might be assessed as undesirable. They might face greater pressure to change, and thus might be less free.

Strains Resulting From the Subjective Warrant

In this research, as in Lortie's, we found what Lortie called the subjective warrant. This is the personal process whereby one qualifies oneself to be in an occupation as well as being licensed by an authority:

> This is the culmination of a longer process during which individuals have played a critical part by qualifying or disqualifying themselves; those who sustain an ambition have tested and retested themselves in terms of a personal conception of what their goal will demand, and have in their own eyes passed those tests (Lortie, 1975, p. 39).

Because of the eased entry into the occupation, teaching has a permissive subjective warrant. The licensing program has not provided as many opportunities for reflecting on performance in relation to models or levels expected by others as have corresponding programs in other more stringent occupations.

The teachers we interviewed found themselves confronted increasingly by the expectations of others. Veterans thought that this situation should have ended or eased as they became more deeply involved in the system. They found, however, that they were not accepted more fully as a part of the system but merely were seen as having been there longer. These veterans felt that their teaching practice had been good and had benefited their students. Even so, their experience did not seem to be considered in the decisions about what was to be taught, who was to be in their classrooms, and how the students should act while they were there.

All of our respondents regarded themselves as qualified teachers. Obviously, as shown by the dispositions of the different types, "qualified" was a relative term. More interesting to us, none of the types believed that their concept of "qualified"—what they felt they should be free to do—was operative in developing the system. In their opinion, how they saw teaching—that is, what qualified them to be teachers—was not considered in the development of the programs. Decisions on what was to be taught and on the mix of students were not ordinarily connected to the experience of teaching. Teachers simply received directives from outside; they continually faced the entry-level condition of "sink or swim."

Strains Resulting From the Orientation to Individualism

The conditions that facilitated the entry into teaching also allowed teachers to expect a freedom that their teaching experience did not confirm. Yet this conflict did not cause teachers to disqualify themselves from teaching because they lacked that desired freedom. The teachers in this study, like those interviewed by Lortie in the mid-1960s, had an orientation toward individualism. The Type 2 teachers, those who sought the freedom of subject matter status, were individualistic as a result of the personal strength drawn from their knowledge of subject matter. Even the Type 1 teachers, who sought the freedom to be student-centered, were not likely to consider other adults as part of the mix unless the involvement of adults related to the teacher's individual understanding of students' needs. Thus, "A

teacher is likely to resist conditions that force change"(Lortie, 1975, p. 210). Teachers in general might not go as far as those who sought the freedom to create microworlds, like the Type 3 teachers, but they seemed able to stay apart from the mainstream without much tension. Type 4 teachers, who taught by happenstance, were seeking a system designed to meet their individual needs. Yet an unanswered question remained when they had difficulty in teaching the new types of students who were entering school or in meeting the new ethos of schooling: How much difference could they tolerate before they no longer felt the freedom to work with dignity?

The teachers we interviewed did not seem to understand that their problems were part of systemic and fundamental change. They viewed them as the result of individual changes that increased the difficulty, rather than as strains resulting from a mass of changes that reflected a new group of students and a new ethos of schooling. Would the teachers recognize the systemic change too late to choose how to respond systematically in their own lives and practice? Would consideration of the new ethos then lie significantly outside their sphere of concerns? As a result, would they be free enough to consider the question of a reformed practice?

To answer questions such as these, we must move from speaking of teachers' perceptions alone to connecting teachers' perceptions of strains to currents that belong to the new ethos of schooling. Accordingly, in the next chapter we examine teachers' perceptions of their work in relation to school reform. In particular, we discuss the reform issue of choice as a means of identifying the context of freedom (choice) available to teachers within the developing new ethos.

4

Teachers' Freedom and Educational Choice

In the previous chapter, we identified four types of teachers. Despite their differences, all of the types were united in their belief that more recent experiences, particularly those involving reform initiatives, left teachers with fewer choices. The strains of eased entry through what Lortie called the subjective warrant and the wide decision range, compounded by the individualism connected with the occupation, had led these teachers to believe that they had had greater decision-making latitude in the past than they did at the time of the interviews.

In the context of contemporary reform initiatives, the teachers found that they lacked freedom to make choices. This might have resulted from an element inherent in the structure of the schools, as they currently function, whereby choice ultimately is "within the direct control, not of those responsible for instruction, but of those who had created and maintained the institutions" (Bailyn, 1960, p. 44).

Struggling for the freedom to act as persons responsible for instruction, our interviewees implied the presence of a metaphor of choice for what they lacked. They gave the impression that they believed others knew nothing about teachers' responsibility. In this chapter, to relate teachers' concerns about their desired choices to the new ethos of schooling, we first outline the choices made in the name of reform by those who direct and maintain the institutions of public education.

THE EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENT OF THE 1980S

In 1983 a series of reports on the condition of U.S. schools and the need for reform began to appear. The most prominent of these reports, *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), declared, "Our nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world" (p. 5). According to *Making the Grade*, a report issued by the Twentieth Century Fund (1983) within months of *A Nation at Risk*:

> The nation's public schools are in trouble. By almost every measure—the commitment and competency of teachers, student test scores, truancy and dropout rates, crimes of violence—the performance of schools fall far short of expectations. (p. 3)

The rhetoric of these and other educational reports of that time focused on the need to improve standards in the schools. Many of these reports employed language and images suggesting that the nation was engaged in a life-and-death struggle for economic and technological superiority. In *Action for Excellence*, for example, which also was published in 1983, the Education Commission of the States explained how America's

> faith in change—and our faith in ourselves as the world's supreme innovators—is being shaken. Japan, West Germany and other relatively new industrial powers have challenged America's position on the leading edge of change and technological innovation. In the seventies, productivity in manufacturing industries grew nearly four times as fast in Japan, and twice as fast in West Germany and France, as in the United States.
>
> The possibility that other nations might outstage us in inventiveness and productivity is suddenly troubling America. (p. 13)

Murphy (1990) described the demand for educational reform during the early 1980s as reflecting a widely held belief that the nation was being crippled by the schools' failure to train people to compete with other industrial nations such as Japan and West Germany. This failure was evidenced in declining student achievement scores; in students' lack of adequate preparation for further education, jobs, and the responsibilities of citizenship; and finally in the growth in the number of school dropouts. According to Murphy, the conditions that were viewed as contributing to schools' failure included ineffec-

tive bureaucratic systems, a lack of commitment on the part of the staff, and poorly defined standards for students.

Murphy (1990) identified three different waves of educational reform beginning in the 1980s. The first wave was characterized by reports such as *A Nation at Risk*; it represented the need to repair the system, or, in his words, the decision to "fix the old clunker" (p. 22). The philosophy underlying these initial decisions to attempt reform emphasized the expansion of centralized control and the implementation of a top-down, bureaucratic model of reform. Mechanisms for implementing reform involved setting performance, establishing incentive programs such as merit pay, and so on.

The second wave of reform encompassed the period between 1986 and 1989, and was characterized by groups such as the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) and the Holmes Group (1986). This second wave called for the "restructuring" of schools and the educational system. The metaphor Murphy used to describe this restructuring movement was the decision to "get a new car"—in other words, to give up on trying to repair the old system and instead to acquire a new automobile. As the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) characterized the situation:

> Much of the rhetoric of the recent education reform movement has been couched in the language of decline, suggesting that standards have slipped, that the education system has grown lax and needs to return to some earlier performance standard to succeed. Our view is very different. We do not believe the educational system needs repairing; we believe it must be rebuilt to match the drastic change needed in our economy if we are to prepare our children for productive lives in the 21st century. (p. 14).

The second wave of reform called for the empowerment of teachers, which was regarded as enabling them to work more effectively with students and the local community. This wave of reform choices went far beyond the proposals made in the reforms that were suggested beginning in 1983. Demands were made to empower and professionalize teaching, to share the power within schools, and to develop decentralized schools (school-based management); these points had been overlooked in the first wave of the reform movement.

Murphy (1990) dated a third wave of reform to the late 1980s. Using his transportation metaphor, he cited the need to "rethink the entire view of transportation" (p. 29). In this third wave, the second wave was regarded as potentially unsuccessful because of the inability of the first and second waves "to address two major problems: (a)

the separation of schools and families and (b) the need to develop, beyond the goals policy makers have heretofore owned, the cognitive *capabilities* of our young people" (Hawley, 1988, p. 416).

In the third wave, the uncoordinated and unconnected approaches to raising children in our culture would be redesigned "for children with both the family and the school at the hub of the service wheel" (Murphy, 1990, p. 29). This wave can be characterized by its attempt to focus on choices related to "the delivery of services to children rather than on the work and governance structures of adults" (p. 29).

The third wave of reform recognizes that the individual's education does not take place only in school, but also as Cremin (1970) argued, in the institutions such as the family, churches, libraries, museums, and the media. It also assumes that traditional systems of schooling are no longer viable because of the choice to deal with the pluralism that has emerged since the 1960s as part of the new ethos of schooling.

This latter point was addressed by Chubb and Moe (1990). Chubb and Moe, as advocates of educational choice, argued that the reforms adapted as part of the first and second waves of reform:

> are destined to fail. Our reason, when all is said and done, is that they simply do not get at the underlying causes of the problem—which have little to do, at least directly, with the graduation requirements or teacher certification or any of the other obvious characteristics of schools and their personnel that have so occupied reformers. It is our view that the most fundamental causes are far less obvious, given the way schools are commonly understood, and far less susceptible to change. They are, in fact, the very institutions that are supposed to be solving the problem: the institutions of direct democratic control. (p. 2)

Chubb and Moe (1990) maintained that reforms characterized by the second wave of reform, such as school-based management, leave "traditional institutions of democratic control intact." Thus "the schools remain subordinates in a democratic hierarchy" (p. 200).

Chubb and Moe (1990) argued that in school-based management programs, the administration ultimately is held responsible for its choices if the schools perform poorly, if they make poor use of financial resources, or if they make politically unpopular choices. When teachers, in exercising their power, make choices that do not agree with community wishes or the philosophy of the school system's central administration, "the schools' superiors will come under intense pressure to use their higher-level authority to take charge and turn matters around" (p. 200). In essence, Chubb and Moe maintained

that school-based management simply represents "another way of controlling the schools within an essentially bureaucratic system" (p. 200). They proposed alternative models, particularly models of educational "choice" that attempt to establish schools that can function outside the limitations and constraints of "democratic control."

Although Chubb and Moe's arguments are compelling, we cannot guarantee the success of their call to establish schools in which greater choice is exercised; nor are we sure that this call will put an end to the successive waves of educational reform that we have seen in recent years. Experience suggests that the process of choice related to a new ethos of schooling may remain highly problematic. We do not anticipate that additional waves of reform will be implemented as new models are tested and found inadequate, but we recognize that such additional waves may materialize. Whether or not the third wave of educational reform is successful, we can relate the types of choices desired by different types of teachers to the various waves of reform.

TEACHERS' CHOICES AND THE EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENT OF THE 1980S

Beginning with the first wave of reform characterized in *A Nation at Risk*, the teacher types we identified in relation to concepts of freedom were affected in various ways by the reforms that were implemented. Among teachers who were seeking the freedom to be student-centered (Type 1), increased graduation requirements, greater demands for accountability in the form of student evaluation and testing, and the establishment of master teacher/career ladders had the effect of distracting them from their primary interest, namely "reaching kids in the classroom." For these teachers, increased mandates from the state legislature and other supervising authorities reduced the time available to work personally with students. The increased amount of paperwork accompanying the implementation of new programs also made it more difficult to work directly with students.

Many of the same problems faced the teachers in Type 2, who were seeking freedom of subject matter status. Curricular choices implemented as part of the reform movement placed greater demands on students, but not necessarily in subject areas that these teachers considered important. Increases in paperwork and accountability deflected these Type 2 teachers from what they viewed as their primary task, namely teaching their students their particular subjects. Fur-

ther problems resulted because the evaluation and testing of students was potentially in subjects that these teachers would not regard as particularly important. Innovations such as career ladders and merit pay distracted them from their primary goal—that is, choosing to relate subject matter effectively to students.

Type 3 teachers—those seeking the freedom to create microworlds—were threatened by accountability mandates imposed from the outside that removed their freedom to choose by telling them how to teach. The reforms that were implemented as part of the first wave directly challenged their choice of the highly circumscribed, tightly controlled microworlds that they had created for themselves. In this context, the first wave of reform threatened their freedom to choose their concept of appropriate instruction.

For the Type 4 teachers, who were teaching by happenstance, the first wave of reform threatened their continued work as teachers. Teacher evaluation programs had been developed primarily for these individuals to provide a mechanism for recognizing their inability to make the right instructional choices. In this way they could be eliminated from the occupation. Testing of their students, observations in their classrooms, and a more carefully controlled curriculum would reveal to the community the failings related to their instructional choices.

From the teachers' perspective—including all four types—the first wave of the educational reform movement provided very little opportunity to choose what was important to them (as defined by the issues they articulated in the interviews). For Type 1 and 2 teachers, the reform movement served primarily as a distraction from choices related to working with students and with subject matter. For Type 3 teachers, the reform movement threatened to break open the tight microworlds that they had constructed so carefully. In the case of Type 4 teachers, the reform movement threatened to expose their inability to make choices that enabled them to function effectively in the classroom.

Attempts at restructuring schools occurred as part of the second wave of educational reform. In Dade County this wave was characterized by programs such as school-based management and shared decision making. In the interviews, Type 1 teachers suggested that restructuring would force them to make choices that would take more away from the classroom and the students, elements they saw as essential to their mission as teachers. Type 2 teachers spoke of difficulties in reforms that would not focus on subject matter and students. For Type 3 teachers, school-based management and shared decision making challenged the microworlds in which they chose to

isolate themselves in order to function. Similarly, master teacher and career ladder programs threatened their choice to pursue models of isolation and self-serving exclusivity.

For the Type 4 teachers, who were in the occupation by happenstance, the demands made by the new decentralized programs of local control would prevent them from choosing to become an effective part of the governance process. Essentially they could not make choices that enabled them to function well in the classroom, so there was no reason to expect that these teachers would function any more effectively at a schoolwide level of responsibility and choice.

Further directions of reform, such as the third wave identified by Murphy (1990), contain important possibilities for enhancing Type 1 and Type 2 teachers' opportunity to make desired choices. Ideally, such future reform could focus on the reality of a separation between schools and families, and on the need to take greater advantage of students' cognitive capabilities. In regard to bridging the separation between schools and families, a potentially important issue is the need for improving teachers' connections to the specific needs of local communities and the families they serve. Thus they could make more highly informed choices for instructing of individual students—the concern of Type 1 teachers. In regard to the emphasis on developing students' cognitive capabilities, it would be possible to capitalize on the importance of the individual's ability to understand and cope with the complexities of the world, and to assist in mastering specific subject areas—a choice of particular interest and concern to Type 2 teachers.

If reforms draw parents and local groups much more fully into the educational process, they can make Type 3 teachers' choice to maintain microworlds much more problematic. In such a case, these teachers' choice of closed and isolated systems would be challenged significantly. They would be subject to increased scrutiny and would be forced to face the assumption of the third wave of reform: For good teaching, a relationship must exist between the choices about what goes on in the classroom and the students' real lives. Likewise, by exposing the Type 4 teachers' inability to make appropriate instructional choices—that is, their inability to meet their students' social and cognitive needs—further reforms could cause their work as teachers to be tolerated less and less.

We are not so naive as to assume that the Type 3 and Type 4 teachers can easily be weeded out of the occupation. As long as teacher shortages persist, together with a reluctance among school boards, building administrators, and union leaders to engage in protracted and expensive grievance procedures, such teachers probably

will hold on and persist within the system. Even so, they are likely to generate complaints to administrators from parents and community members, as to whether schools are choosing to address the students' academic and social needs.

In many respects, accounts such as Murphy's description of a third wave of reform are logical corollaries to the new ethos of schooling. Such accounts potentially can encompass many of the points of pressure or tension that teachers have experienced with the emergence of this new ethos.

EDUCATIONAL CHOICE AND EDUCATIONAL CONTROL

In speaking of choice, we referred to the ideas presented by Chubb and Moe (1990). They advocated choice in schools, but could imagine it happening only if schools are freed from their traditional role as "institutions of democratic control" (p. 2). The recent reform movement has included talk of choice, but not real choice, as defined by Chubb and Moe, because the traditional limiting system of control remains intact. It seems to us that the teachers we interviewed face this dilemma in their work: They want choice, even while keeping traditional control intact. Thus they fall prey to problems identified by Chubb and Moe as involving school choice, which exist in a system of traditional democratic control.

The first problem facing school choice advocates, as Chubb and Moe (1990) pointed out, is "they all claim to favor choice, but when it comes down to specifics of actual choice plans, their superficial consensus breaks down" (p. 207). It seems to us that all of the different teacher types we have identified desire greater choice. Yet what makes them different as teachers also leads them to make different choices. Even though the idea of a modal teacher (as described by Lortie) remains viable, in areas involving opportunities for choice, Type 1 teachers will concentrate on choices involving working with students, whereas Type 2 teachers will seek choices related to subject matter. Type 3 teachers will make choices to protect their microworlds; Type 4 teachers will have difficulty in making personal choices. Thus teachers collectively are likely to remain frustrated in their desire for choice because they lack consensus.

A second problem that Chubb and Moe (1990) identified is that reform is "entirely demand focused" (p. 207). If real choice and real competition are to exist, they believe "the supply side must be freed up" (p. 208). Even though teachers spoke in ways implying a desire

for choice, their basic orientations still cause them to abhor competition among themselves and among schools. Teachers want the basic structures of support, such as pay scales, formal rules, and continued guarantees that they can maintain the little control they possess. Therefore, according to Chubb and Moe's thesis about schools, they are likely to remain unsuccessful in their demand for choices because they themselves place limits on the choices that are available.

As a third problem, Chubb and Moe (1990) expressed their belief that without fundamental change in the traditional structure of public schools, the opportunity for change remains part of the struggle among traditionally contentious political forces: "Choice becomes part of a big compromise among contending political powers—no one loses jobs, no bad schools are closed down, vested interests remain securely vested, the basic structure stays the same" (p. 208). Even though teachers want more choices, they want them within the same framework. The teachers' ambivalence, which we mentioned earlier, frustrates the attainment of the real choices that teachers desire. We repeat Lortie's (1975) observation:

> There is a certain ambivalence, then, in the teacher's sentiments. He yearns for more independence, greater resources, and, just possibly, more control over key resources. But he accepts the hegemony of the school system on which he is economically and functionally dependent. He cannot ensure that the imperatives of teaching, as he defines them, will be honored, but he chafes when they are not. (p. 186)

In continuing to accept the hegemony of school systems as they are, teachers will continue to be frustrated in their desire for greater choice.

Because nobody has rushed to implement the ideas of Chubb and Moe, it is easy to argue that they are not readily accepted. Certainly we see serious problems in their schema. Yet in exploring the ramifications of choice, they have enabled us to identify three fundamental issues that are part of teachers' frustration regarding choice: (a) lack of consensus on the meaning of choice, (b) the desire to maintain existing frameworks of control, and (c) continued acceptance of the hegemony of the system, which makes teachers themselves part of the reason why they lack greater choices and thus lack freedom in their work. These strains seem to result from what Lortie (1975) identified as the lack of a tradition of professional collegial action. Yet, as he observed, "whether teachers choose more collegial control or more authority for administrators, they will need strong mechanisms of collegial action in order to make a viable decision" (Chubb

& Moe, 1990, p. 224–225). Lacking such a tradition of collegial action, teachers as a group may need to acknowledge their own contribution to the strains that result in a lack of choice in their work. When teachers chafe at this lack, it is quite possible that they are chafing at the results of their own choices as well as the choices of others that are imposed on them. In the interviews included here, it seems clear that the teachers hardly understand the role of their choices in creating the system, much less how those choices may constrict other choices they wish to make as professionals working in the schools.

Because of frustration with the lack of choice due to lack of consensus over the meanings of choice and freedom, maintenance of existing frameworks of control, and continued acceptance of the hegemony of the system, it is a small wonder that freedom is not the only issue entailing strain for teachers. What underlies teachers' frustration about freedom also leaves them feeling that their authority is in question. In the next chapter we deepen our exploration by examining the strain that teachers experience in relation to the authority to teach.

5

The Authority to Teach

Drawing on the findings of Chapter 3, we now examine interviewees' attitudes concerning authority in light of their predominant dispositions toward teaching (teacher Types 1–4). We are interested not only in understanding how these four groups of teachers describe authority, but also in how the groups differ from one another in their descriptions of authority and its meaning. In addition, we examine factors that may increase or diminish the authority of teachers with each of the four predominant dispositions. Before we proceed, however, we must explain how the concept of authority is related to the ethos of schooling.

AUTHORITY AND THE ETHOS OF SCHOOLING

Control of public education in the United States is highly fragmented. In recent years it has become increasingly difficult to determine who has authority in the schools. From a strictly legalistic point of view, authority over the schools—the content of curriculum, regulations and rules, goals, and objectives—is the responsibility of local boards of education. Yet despite their important role in defining the ethos of schooling, local boards of education are only one of many forces that must be understood if we are to address the issue.

The general public, parents, administrators, and teachers all exercise different types and degrees of authority over the schools. Nyberg and Farber (1986), in discussing educational authority, pointed to the critical distinction between the authority "to oversee the establishment, maintenance, and administration of the schools" and the "authority to exercise expert judgment over the content of the

curriculum and means of instruction" (p. 5). The first type of authority involves sociopolitical, economic, legal, and organizational issues. The second type involves educational expertise and knowledge. The kinds of expertise needed to exercise each of these types of authority are obviously very different.

The authority assigned to teachers is carefully circumscribed. According to Nyberg and Farber (1986):

> Public-school teachers have almost no authority over the design and administration of the institutions in which they exercise their "educational authority" as subject matter specialists and as adepts in pedagogy. Criteria for determining class composition and size, scheduling, curriculum and text content; the training, evaluation, and promotion of faculty; delegating work loads; planning and allocation of "space" (from the site selection of the campus buildings to the size and shape of individual offices and teaching rooms), and so on-all this is controlled by legislatures and by lay boards and their administrators. (p. 4)

In addition, Grant (1988) and other authors, such as Benne (1970), pointed out that a great deal of confusion exists about the meaning of authority in the larger U.S. society.[1] According to Grant (1988), "Americans are especially likely to conflate authority with authoritarianism, although the latter is meant to denote a repressive or even totalitarian climate" (p. 120). During the 1960s, authority became highly suspect. As the new ethos of schooling began to emerge, opposition to change was seen as coming from traditional "authorities."

Authority was challenged on almost every level of the culture: the authority of Whites over Blacks, of men over women, of traditional models of education over more experimental models, and of the government to conduct the war in southeast Asia. Yet, as Grant (1988) pointed out in reference to Arendt's work, every social institution must strike a balance between authority and liberty, or what we choose here to call freedom. The lack of freedom leads to tyranny,

---

[1] Benne quoted Burke in a 1937 article in the *New Republic* to the effect that authority is

> admittedly a vague term. Better designed for pointing-in-the-direction-of-something than for clear demarcation of that-in-the-direction-of-which-we-would-point, it puts together in the lump our attitude towards rulers, courts, parliaments, laws, educators, constabulary, and the moral slogans linked with them.

Benne went on to assert that vagueness about the use of the term "authority" persists.

just as the absence of authority leads to abusive license. In Arendt's (1968/1977) words: "Authority implies an obedience in which men [sic] retain their freedom" (p. 106).

How teachers exercise their authority shapes the ethos of an individual school—and, on a larger scale, the ethos of schooling. This is not to suggest that the ethos of schooling is defined primarily by teachers—only that they are one of the many factors that contribute to this definition.

For our examination of teachers' authority, Benne (1970) provided us with a useful discussion of authority and its role in education.[2] Benne identified three types of authority: expert authority, rule authority, and anthropogogical authority.

Expert Authority, Rule Authority, and Anthropogogical Authority

Benne described *expert authority* by outlining the relationship between a doctor and his or her patient. A doctor is granted authority on the basis of specialized knowledge about certain aspects of health and disease. A patient grants the doctor authority to treat him or her because the doctor's competence and expertise have the potential to restore the patient to good health. The doctor's expert authority, however, does not extend to other areas of the patient's life. Thus, political or economic advice is not part of the doctor's expertise. According to Benne (1970), expert knowledge has two principal characteristics. First, "the field is independent of the will or fiat of the bearer of authority or of the consistent fiat of bearer and subject" (p. 395). In other words, the doctor alone or in collaboration with the patient cannot simply will or command the patient to recover. What the doctor does must be tested against objective factors and forces.

The second characteristic of expert knowledge is based on the fact that "the expert authority relationship is grounded in a persistent differentiation of function and specialized ability between bearer and subjects" (Benne, 1970, p. 395). Thus, according to Benne (1970):

> We may contrast the relationship of a doctor to a patient with that of the doctor as teacher of a medical student. The patient accepts the ad-

[2] In this chapter we rely on Benne's categories and descriptors of authority concerns from this 1970 article. In Chapter 6 we also use his more recent work on anthropogogy (Benne, 1990) in exploring the deeper meaning of the discussions in this chapter.

> vice or command of the doctor, not in the hope of becoming a doctor, but in hope of getting or staying well. The medical student puts himself under the authority of the doctor in the hope of himself becoming a doctor and entering into the collegial community of doctors. There is, if the latter relationship is successful, an increasing coincidence between the student's need and the doctor's competence, not a persistent differentiation of function and specialized ability, as in the case of the patient and doctor. (p. 395)

Rule authority is similar to the operation and function of rules in a game. When a group of people play baseball, hockey, or a board game such as Monopoly, they play under the authority of a set of rules, which they obey in order to realize the potential of playing the game—that is, the excitement, recreation, pleasure, and so on. Under the authority of rules, the bearer of authority can be difficult to locate. Often the rules themselves serve this function. Thus games must be played "according to Hoyle." The rules of baseball "are sanctioned by precedent, by traditions of great players, and great ball clubs, by present general acceptance, and by the current committee on rule revision" (Benne, 1970, p. 395).

To describe the third type of authority in education, Benne used a term of his own invention: anthropogogical authority. *Anthropogogical authority* is rational and situationally determined. In the case of the doctor and the medical student, according to Benne (1970), anthropogogical authority involves a situation in which:

> The field of the authority relation is marked by a growing coincidence between the doctor's status and competence and the student's need. If the authority relation is successful, there is a movement towards collegiality between teacher and student. The task of medical education is to help induct aspirants into membership in the medical community. (p. 400)

Anthropogogical authority is based on the idea that the actual bearers and subjects of this authority together build

> a proximate set of mutual relationships in which the aim is the development of skills, knowledge, values, and commitments which will enable the subjects to function more fully and adequately as participants in a wider community life which lies beyond the proximate educational associations. (p. 401)

Educational theorists such as Freire (1970a, 1970b, 1973) touch on the idea of anthropogogical authority when they discuss the impor-

tance of dialogue in the teaching process and the development of critical consciousness in those who are taught.

How are these three types of authority manifested in the teachers we interviewed? Those teachers who indicated that they should be granted authority on the basis of specialized, "expert" knowledge were those we identified as Type 3 teachers, who were seeking the freedom to create microworlds. Teachers who identified their authority through "rules" in a game were Type 4 teachers, who were teaching by happenstance. We identified anthropogogical authority as the concern of Types 1 and 2 teachers, those seeking the freedom to be student-centered and those seeking the freedom of subject matter status. Type 1 and Type 2 teachers believed that their authority derived, in somewhat different ways, from rational or situationally determined experiences. We explore aspects of these correspondences in the following sections of this chapter.

ANTHROPOGOGICAL AUTHORITY AND TEACHERS WHO SEEK THE FREEDOM TO BE STUDENT-CENTERED

The Type 1 teachers, a total of 30 of our 73 respondents, regarded students as the primary focus of their work. Although subject matter was a concern for this group, they were concerned mainly with empowering of students "to function more fully and adequately as participants in a wider community life which lies beyond proximate educational associations" (Benne, 1970, p. 401). Reaching students, no matter how serious their problems or needs, was a challenge and a responsibility that many of the teachers in this group met readily. As Joan explained:

> I had a boy that has been in all kinds of institutions and everything and he is trying to be a really bad kid, a real wise kid, and I went up to him and I said, "You know, Billy, I would notice you even if you didn't act up this way. You don't have to do it for my benefit. I know you're here." The kid was doing it—even if he was yelled at, at least it was a recognition. I thought to myself, "Why is he doing this?" I would find myself knotting up just before the class and I thought that there had to be a way to reach him. (33, F, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.)

For these teachers, establishing a facilitative and supportive climate in the classroom was crucial. They seemed to epitomize the ideal of anthropogogical authority by establishing meaningful "dia-

logic" (Benne, 1970, p. 406) communication. This did not mean that they neglected the subject matter, but only that it was secondary to interpersonal relationships. The Type 1 teachers were convinced that establishing a dialogue between student and teacher was of primary importance to the act of teaching. These feelings are evident in Catherine's description of a "good day":

> [On a] good day, for me, this year, I would be able to talk to my students without having to raise my voice, and somebody would be able to relate to me something positive about either the lesson or about something that has happened in his or her life that pertains to something that I am teaching. (13, F, W, Jr/L, 6th)

In Catherine's view and in Benne's (1970) words, "authority must operate in relation to a community process in which those being educated are involved as participants" (p. 402).

Type 1 teachers deal with discipline problems from an anthropogogical and psychological perspective. Teachers in this group, who are seeking the freedom to be student-centered, consider it absolutely necessary to work sympathetically with people in order to achieve their goals as teachers. As much as possible, they try to be diplomats, counselors, and "gentle persuaders," reaching out to the people they serve in order to work with and lead them "into processes of learning and reeducation" (Benne, 1970, p. 400).

Catherine, quoted earlier, is an example of a teacher reaching out to one of her students and his parents. In dealing with a student who swore in class and behaved disruptively, she described to us how she quietly disciplined the student and then followed up with a call to one of his parents. In doing so, she asserted her authority as the "controller" of the situation, but also demonstrated sensitivity and insight in dealing with the issue. As she said in reference to the general situation, "I am a controller in this. I'm the one who called the parent, and said that I'm not writing this up, but if this happens again, I am going to write it on paper and turn it in" (13, F, W, Jr/L, 6th).

Catherine also regarded herself as able to "work with parents very well." Her anthropogogical authority is evident in the fact that in most school years, she contacted all of her students' parents: "We talk a while and I get to know the parents and I welcome them to call me if there are problems." She was "very bothered" that because of problems with time, for the first time in her career she had not been able to contact her students' parents. In her mind, responsibility for educating a student was shared by the teacher and the student's par-

ents. Each had their own domain of instruction—the areas that they needed to emphasize. As Catherine stated:

> I think we've learned we can't teach the whole child. The parents have to do some teaching. If there is religion involved, it should be the family taking care of that with the church, and then there is learning arithmetic, learning science, social studies. (13, F, W, Jr/L, 6th)

For Catherine, a commitment to education on the part of a student's parents—to the goals and ideals of education—was absolutely crucial to academic and personal success beyond the classroom, in "the life of a wider and other community" (Benne, 1970, p. 401).

Catherine believed that her most successful children were those whose parents had "given a plus to education." Too often she felt that children came to school provided with only limited direction and purpose by their parents. She complained that many parents did not give their children "much in life to base anything on." The schools, she thought, were overloaded with the responsibilities of teaching manners, sex education, and drug prevention. Without the parents' active collaboration, Catherine believed strongly that the typical child's various complex needs simply could not be met.

The ability to work with people, to get the best and the most from them, is a fundamental characteristic of the authority that Type 1 teachers expect to exercise. They are concerned about success—both personal and academic. Victoria even described how helping kids to succeed was one of her "strengths":

> I feel that I can really work with them and get them to want to learn. . . . I feel that I can work with people very well. I have a technique . . . if a person doesn't care for me—and I can detect it—I [can] still go to that person and be their friend. (71, F, B, Sr/M, Spec.Ed./L.D.)

Gaining the trust of both students and their parents was viewed by these teachers as a challenging and sometimes difficult task—one that was affected seriously by desegregation and other social and political changes in the community. This is not surprising because in anthropogogical authority, "the ultimate bearer of educational authority is a community in which subjects are seeking fuller and more valid membership" (Benne, 1970, p. 401). Paula, for example, a White kindergarten teacher, described the difficulties of adjusting to teaching in a poor Black neighborhood in Liberty City as part of the 1970 desegregation order by Judge C. Clyde Atkins. To her, the cul-

ture of the school to which she was assigned was "totally foreign." By working in the school and coming to terms with its culture, she described herself as learning

> [N]ot a new way of teaching but a new way of listening, I think that's the most important thing I learned. It took from September to February for me to start teaching. I did not teach until February. I disciplined, I reacted, and I kept learning and I kept changing. In February we started getting down to business. It took that long. By June we were going gangbusters. (56, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten)

Other people's insensitivity to the cultural mix of the Miami community—of its particular conditions and needs—led one teacher to criticize individuals who came into the school system and the community and passed judgments about what would be best for it. Catherine, the White junior high school teacher we have quoted here, was originally from the South and had lived in New Jersey for a number of years. She explained how strongly she resented

> . . . people from the North trying to tell people from the South what to do when they did not have a revolution of blacks and whites in New Jersey like they did down in this area. The Kennedys never had their children go to school in Dade County. (13, F, W, Jr/L, 6th)

Fair, firm, and friendly would characterize the authority exercised by many of the Type 1 teachers. In discussing their work they often indicated that their authority derived from their students' respect for them. In turn, their students' respect was predicated on the teachers' respect for the students. The result was an anthropogogical "movement toward collegiality between teacher and student" (Benne, 1970, p. 400) centered around classroom work. As Barbara pointed out, mutual respect between teacher and students was absolutely necessary for functioning together effectively. Students were perceived as needing to respect themselves and those around them—both the teacher and other students:

> I'll tell the kids all the time you respect me and I'm going to respect you, or rather I respect you, so therefore I expect you to respect me. And then one day I might say something and they say, "Ah ah ah, you're not respecting me." It comes back to haunt me every now and then. But I think if the beginning teacher would remember just some basic things—that kids are people too—they're not going to have a lot of problems. (08, F, B, Jr/H, Spec.Ed./V.E.)

These teachers believed that administrators, as well as teachers, had to demonstrate respect for the students as part of an anthropogogical environment. Victoria spoke admiringly of a principal who was a strong disciplinarian, but also was sensitive to the feelings of the students in his school:

> He was a very strong disciplinarian, very strong, but very considerate of the children's feelings, the way they felt. He set guidelines, and he expected the students to follow them. He was not . . . too rigid with them, but rigid enough. . . . If a student had a problem, he would take off and listen. (71, F, B, Sr/M, Spec.Ed./L.D.)

The Type 1 teachers often perceived high expectations as producing positive results. Brenda provided her students with the authority to act because she had consistently high expectations of them:

> I think I motivate the children to really want to do well. I have very high expectations for the children. I have talked to my principal and other principals that I've had over the years and thought that maybe my expectations were maybe too much, but I don't think that I can lower them. I just think that is within me. So, I just tell my children, the very first day of school, that this is the best class and I'm the best teacher, and we sort of go from there. I don't tolerate. I just expect the best from them and they know that right off the bat. (11, F, W, Elem/H, Primary)

Even though Type 1 teachers were seeking the freedom to be student-centered or coparticipant in the education process, they were not interested in becoming friends with their students. In some instances, being a "friend" had the potential to jeopardize their authority and discipline. This did not preclude these teachers from being friendly and supportive, however. As Victoria explained, "I let them know, you are here to learn, and I'm your teacher. . . . I'm not your mother, and I'm not your tight buddy" (71, F, B, Sr/M, Spec.Ed./L.D.). When asked what advice she would give to new teachers entering the profession, Victoria said she would tell them that in dealing with students, they needed to remember:

> You are a teacher. You are not necessarily their buddy, their friend. . . . You need to set guidelines from day one, and let them know it. You are not their little buddy, even though you might look as young as they do. You are a teacher. You have been trained as a teacher, and you are not here to sit in the classroom and do what they want to do. (71, F, B, Sr/M, Spec.Ed./L.D.)

Rules, according to the teachers in Type 1, had to be clearly outlined and defined for students so that the student–teacher relationship would not be jeopardized. Consistency was considered absolutely imperative. Fairness and honesty on the part of the teacher were also felt to be essential. All of this places in an anthropogogical perspective the importance of the "common life processes of those being educated" (Benne, 1970, p. 402). Benjamin said:

> I'm the mean ogre, but I'm the first one they say hello to in the morning. . . . They all know that I'm totally honest with them. They do something wrong, they're going to be punished for it right then. I'm not calling mommy, I'm not waiting. Mommy wants to call me, that's fine, and if the principal gives in to mommy, that's fine. But the next time he's going to have to go through the same thing, 'cause the rules are the same for everybody, and they appreciate it. (05, M, W, Elem/H, Phys.Ed.)

Likewise, the teachers presented the students as needing to be confronted with the consequences of their actions. Even if they were caught every time they did something wrong, their behavior eventually would catch up with them. As Benjamin pointed out, "If you're doing something wrong you're going to pay for it." For him, justice was swift, sure, and inevitable: "You're going to pay for it right away. My system is better than the American judicial system. We don't wait for three weeks of appeals and 14 months of—it happens right now. And it works! It works for me!" (05, M, W, Elem/H, Phys.Ed.).

"Theater" played a significant role in Type 1 teachers' dealings with individual students. Theatricality also was perceived as risky; however, Benjamin, who had taught in both suburban and inner-city schools, explained that behavior that was appropriate in one setting could be disastrous in another. Authority, in his view, depended on rules that could be changed or altered according to the anthropogogical context:

> So I need something to get their attention. So it's anything I can think of. I've been known to walk out and all of a sudden fall down. And then they go, "What's he going to do next?" Let them look at that. Let them think I'm crazy. They all think I'm crazy. They do. And that's what they should do. But, that's what works for me here. (05, M, W, Elem/H, Phys.Ed.)

According to Benjamin, however, "craziness" or "divine madness" was not necessarily appropriate for certain educational settings. If he did the same thing "in an inner-city school, I'd lose the kids. They'd be gone. I'd never get them back. It would take me 30 minutes to calm

them down. I think being able to adapt to the situation is very important" (05, M, W, Elem/H, Phys.Ed.).

Type 1 teachers seemed to be much more concerned about being accused of malpractice and being sued than the other three groups of teachers in our study. Perhaps this was due to the anthropogogical truth that "the authority is exercised as [the teacher] seeks to give form, content and direction" (Benne, 1970, p. 402) rather than being expressed in specific actions approved by an outside authority. Whatever the cause, these teachers made numerous references to the possibility that their actions could be misinterpreted and, in an increasingly litigious culture, could be the basis for legal action against them. As Ruth pointed out, "I think there is more stress now by virtue of, maybe, malpractice. I don't know if that's the right word, but . . . a parent, if a kid fell off the monkey bars and broke their arm, they would be inclined to sue you now" (61, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten). Ruth found it necessary to defend herself from potential lawsuits. In the past, she had perceived that professionals like herself were trusted by the general public, but now she felt that she had to be more careful. Her comments reflected her sense of having lost a potent and important type of personal authority, namely "the mandate of the wider community [she] represents" (Benne, 1970, p. 402).

Gertrude, a 30-year veteran of the system, expressed the feeling that teachers increasingly had become "much more restricted in what they can do with kids . . . all this bit with physical abuse and sexual abuse, and all the other nonsense. I feel a lot of teachers are even afraid to touch a child" (24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary). Unfortunately, teachers who were inclined to seek the freedom to be student-centered became increasingly careful about what they did. Gertrude described how a little girl in her class had lost her preprimer. When Gertrude found it, she called the child up to the front of the class and teased her, saying "Look what I found." When she tapped the student with the book, the student started laughing hysterically and "thought it was the funniest thing in the world." Then, as Gertrude recalled:

> About three minutes later I was called into the principal's office for hitting a child with a book and I said to the principal, "Did you see my face? Did you see the child's face?" No! All she saw was I had hit the child with the book. (24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary)

Gertrude also described how her husband, an industrial arts teacher

> saw a [power saw] blade shatter a few weeks ago and he ran over and pushed the children back out of the way because he was afraid that these pieces would go flying. All of a sudden security was there, and everyone else was accusing him of shoving children, knocking them over, etc. (24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary)

Teachers fearing legal liability described how they were no longer willing to help children in fundamental ways that had been part of their professional activities in the past. Paula, a kindergarten teacher, said that if her children could not make their zippers work, for example, she and another colleague, with whom she team taught, no longer helped them. Similarly, if a child needed to be reprimanded, in the past the teacher might have grabbed "them by their shirt and put them in their seats." With the changes in parents' attitudes and the increased potential for lawsuits, however, she and her partner no longer behaved in this way (56, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten). Patricia characterized her situation quite clearly. She felt that teaching had become

> more vulnerable to lawsuits today than ever before. I think that oftentimes you're afraid to say and do certain things that you feel the student may need to hear or may need to be exposed to because of all this business that has come along over the years. You're not allowed to say anything about God, you're not allowed to say anything about certain other things. You're really handicapped in what you can do and say, and I don't think that that's right. (55, F, W, Sr/L, Spec.Ed./V.E.)

ANTHROPOGOGICAL AUTHORITY AND TEACHERS WHO SEEK THE FREEDOM OF SUBJECT MATTER STATUS

A number of the interviews showed clearly the extent to which Type 2 teachers define themselves, and particularly their authority, in terms of subject matter. This focus on subject matter might lead one to regard Type 2 teachers as using expert authority. In subject matter, however, they did not consider themselves expert chemists or expert historians. Rather, they saw themselves as teachers of chemistry or teachers of history, even though the subject matter gave them an essential rational knowledge to work with. This approach is anthropogogical because these teachers fit the following description:

> Actual bearers and subjects of this authority must together build a proximate set of mutual relationships in which the aim is the develop-

> ment of skills, knowledge, values and commitments which will enable the subjects to function more fully and adequately as participants in a wider community life which lies beyond the proximate educational associations. (Benne, 1970, p. 401)

More importantly, Type 2 teachers considered good teaching a situationally based endeavor. Mary exemplifies how Type 2 teachers exert situational (anthropogogical) authority through subject matter. She felt that knowing one's subject matter was essential to working successfully in the classroom: "You better not go into a group of kids if you don't know what you're teaching because they will nail you to the wall and they'll do it on day one and you don't stand a chance" (47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.). Mary viewed the situational realities of classroom authority and control as based on command of one's subject area. Without a command of the subject, she believed, one could not even begin to address the other issues essential to teaching effectively.

Although some of our interviewees knew that knowledge is power, and ultimately an important source of their authority, they also recognized an authority that derived from being able to tell a good story, to present an interesting set of facts, and even occasionally to fascinate and amaze. In these experiences students encounter the power and authority of the knowledge they are exploring. William commented:

> The subject matter that I teach is fascinating because it is never standing still. In health there are always new discoveries going on; everything is constantly moving. . . . It's one semester, so you don't have time to slow down really and get bored with what you're doing. By the time you teach it the next semester, it's changed drastically in at least two or three areas. I enjoy the interaction with the kids because you can see them develop mentally along the line and that keeps you going. (73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./Health)

Mark recognized the importance of knowledge as the basis for his authority and success as a teacher, but also regarded the ability to communicate, simplify, and inform as critical to successful teaching:

> I personally am a strong proponent of knowledge, and I think a person has to know a great deal before he can—as one of my old professors used to . . . say, "to simplify something and still make it true," still make it adhere to the factual situation, takes a good deal of knowledge. (42, M, W, Sr/H, Soc.Stud.)

Despite the importance that many Type 2 teachers placed on subject matter in defining their work and authority in the classroom, they did not ignore the dialogic aspects of anthropogogical authority in their work. After dealing with subject matter, Mary said, "The next thing again, I guess, is to be able to talk to them. Now in a group of 30–35 students you're not going to be able to reach all of them, but you can sure try" (47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.). Because she was interested primarily in subject matter, Mary was unwilling to reduce herself to the students' level in order to achieve success. She was not sure whether she did not "want to get down on their level" or did not want her students "to always stay at that level." As she explained, "I don't mind coming down a little bit but I sure don't want to stay there" (47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.). Although it was important for Mary to reach her students, ultimately she could not divorce herself from her subject. She felt strongly, and probably rightly, that if she did so, ultimately she would not be serving their needs. This attitude corresponds to the anthropogogical concern to see each student grow to be an adult—that is, "the fundamental interest of those associated with him [the student] in growing up more fully into free and responsible manhood and womanhood" (Benne, 1970, p. 402).

Respect—which implies that one possesses authority—is an important issue for many of the Type 2 teachers. Some of these teachers indicated that they felt they deserved greater respect from the general public than they received. This is not surprising because respect is connected to the mandate to teach. In addition to a fundamental interest in students, anthropogogical authority derives from "the mandate of the wider community [that the teacher] represents in the educational process" (Benne, 1970, p. 402). As Mary expressed it:

> I would like the whole attitude of respect towards the teaching profession to be reviewed. Again, teachers are being paid to be servants. They are paid to be babysitters. I'd like this attitude to be removed from society. Let's go back to the point of saying, "Hey, this person has something to give. . . . You may not get it all, but at least listen and have respect. Don't disrupt and disturb." (47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.)

Mary's sense of authority was derived in part from her deep understanding of her subject and her ability to communicate it. She believed that society undervalued this aspect of her work, which was obviously critical to her definition of self.

This teacher recognized that her inner sense of authority did not command as much attention as it might have received in the past; television and media culture represent an alternative informational

and cultural authority. When Mary first began teaching 25 years ago, she did not feel that she was competing with television in presenting her subject specialty. When she returned to teaching after raising a family, she found that she was in direct competition with television for her students' attention:

> They expect bombs and explosions. They're not concerned with learning so they can protect themselves. They're not interested in learning for safety's sake, and I guess maybe that's where I'm coming from. I want to teach you something about this so that you'll have an idea of what it means to be cautious. You don't throw a pound of sodium in a pond and say, "Hey, guys, look at the fireworks." But this is what they want to see happen, and those are the responses . . . accidents that have occurred in the classroom . . . have brought the greatest joy to those kids. (47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.)

Other teachers in this group found it difficult to deal with the rejection, by students and their parents, of the subjects that they teach and think are important. Not only do they have a passion for their subjects; they also derive some of their mandate or authority from the importance of knowledge of their subject area. If that subject is systematically ignored or trivialized, then so too is their authority. William experienced this:

> I'm finding less and less cooperation with parents and students in the classroom. Fewer and fewer want to do any assignment to keep up, no matter what you do. You say, "Look, get to class on time. You have five minutes to get from one door, walk 30 feet, and come in the next one." Well, I have kids that will have 30 tardies and you can give them two hours in detention after school. They don't show. They're still late to class. Give them SCSI, which is getting them out of class to begin with. They're still late to class when they come back. Give them outdoor suspension. They're still late to class. It seems to be increasing, I've never had so many. (73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./Health)

Type 2 teachers much more frequently expressed the importance of having had outstanding teachers as models than did any of the other groups of teachers in our interviews. They perceived teachers as "surrogate" bearers of the school's authority—teachers to be admired and respected (Benne, 1970, p. 402). Clearly they had internalized this anthropogogical belief early in their experience. Mark stated that even though his attraction to the field was primarily an outgrowth of his love for his subject:

> I think also I had the—I would now say—naive idea that teaching and teachers were a class apart from the normal population and were superior, if you will—had idealism and inspirations that other people didn't have—that teachers would be a group of people far and above the average citizen . . . and that was a good group to be a part of. (42, M, W, Sr/H, Soc.Stud.)

More than any other group, the Type 2 teachers spoke of teachers who had been important to them in their own education. The teachers in this group were especially impressed with these individuals' anthropogogical authority with respect to their subject matter, which resulted in a special ability to communicate their material to students. Mary's most memorable teacher was

> a math teacher who minced no words. He was not a very outgoing person. He knew his subject matter, and we all walked into the first day of class knowing [that his attitude was that] "My dog is smarter than any of yours." Not very many people respond to that type of attitude. (47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.)

This teacher challenged Mary in a special way. She expressed grit and determination about receiving his respect when she recalled that she was determined to be taken seriously by him:

> I was going to show him, I may not be your brightest, but I am certainly not the dumbest. He also made it known that he was not particularly fond of girls. They had no business in science. They had no business in math. I thought, "Hey buddy, you know, here I am." But basically he was just honest and a fair teacher, and I admired him and I learned a lot. I guess . . . of all the professors that I had, he was the one that I learned the most from. (47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.)

It is interesting, in this case, that the math professor was remembered as commanding authority by being fair and honest. Authority need not be demanded or consciously exercised. In the anthropogogical context of being a surrogate for the community's mandate and its interest in its students, authority existed simply by virtue of the teachers' understanding of the subject matter and their capacity to communicate its content. Methods of discipline and references to teaching techniques were unnecessary in light of mastery of the subject.

Although a focus on subject matter was essential to all of these teachers, being "a buddy" to the students was not necessary to the success of the teachers who had influenced them most in their own educational experience. Roberta, for example, recalled a history and

civics teacher from her junior high school days in Alabama, and how much she differed from her other teachers:

> She had her hair cut very short, and most people didn't. [She] wore big glasses, she was very stern, very strict, had a lot of discipline in the classroom. You took notes. She didn't take anything, and everything was very structured. . . . I've tried to pattern myself after people like that. (59, F, B, Jr/H, Spec.Ed./L.D.)

Even so, Roberta described this teacher as having a wonderful ability to communicate subject matter.

In commenting on the teachers who she thought were outstanding in the school where she currently worked, Roberta indicated that she thought most highly of the teachers who were "very stern" and "very structured." These types of teacher, she felt, "survive best in education" (59, F, B, Jr/H, Spec.Ed./L.D.).

Teachers who demanded discipline and hard work from students commanded Type 2 teachers' respect and admiration. For these teachers, the anthropogogical task of fitting students "for active, free, and responsible membership in the wider community in which they live and hope to live more fully" (Benne, 1970, p. 402) is a very serious endeavor. In some cases, when they were students, these teachers had not necessarily liked the teachers they admired in retrospect. Agnes recalled a teacher she now particularly admires:

> She was not one of those I liked when I was in school. I mean, I respected her, but I wouldn't say she was the teacher I was very crazy about. She respected herself and she respected the students. She was firm but she was loving, and even if she did something that . . . seemed very hard, you always felt she did [it with] your best interest in mind. Even when she punished you, you felt it was in your best interest. . . . She was fair and she made you feel that what you were doing was important. . . . Not just for the moment [but] for [your] entire life to come. (04, F, B, Jr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

An ability to be demanding, and yet to relate to people, was an essential characteristic of this teacher. Clearly at work was an anthropogogical authority on the part of this and many of the other teachers who were most admired by our respondents. Those outstanding teachers demonstrated a passion for their subject matter and the people they taught. In a sense, the two could not be separated. Bonnie described a science teacher whom she had admired:

> He had a great sense of humor, rapport with the kids, and yet he did these experiments. I still remember how interesting they were. . . . He liked children. He wasn't just there, and that came through. He teased you, and yet when it came to the subject, I still remember writing up those experiments. (10, F, W, Sr/M, Soc.Stud./His.)

Many of the teachers interviewed knew that anthropogogical authority was important if they were to succeed as teachers. They recognized the need to reach out to parents, as well as to their students, "to cultivate mutual processes of common association which, by design, reach beyond these [school] relationships into the life of the wider and other community" (Benne, 1970. p. 401). Yet in many instances, the parents with whom they tried to work were not only uncooperative but outright hostile. A major source of difficulty for William was the

> lack of support and interest from the parents. I have had cases where I will call up the parent and say "Listen, I've given such and such an assignment. Your son or daughter is starting to fall way behind and really needs to complete this assignment. I want you to be aware of it. Maybe you could work with him and help him along with it." Several times I've gotten the response . . . "Well, what my son or daughter does at school is his or her business, and I'm not going to get involved with it." (73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./Health)

Because this teacher's authority was rejected—both his personal authority and the authority of the subject he cared about so passionately—he was left with virtually no constructive recourse and no anthropogogical mandate. Although he wanted to draw on anthropogogical authority, and in turn to establish a meaningful dialogue, he encountered parents who refused to communicate and engage in the issues surrounding their child's education.

Our respondents believed that this phenomenon of uncooperative parents[3] was reinforced by several factors. William referred to the failure of the administration to be supportive:

> The particular school I'm at, we've seen some very strange things as far as administration goes. A teacher sends a student down to the office for discipline because the kid basically threw a chair, something of this nature. By the time you get down in there after class to join that

[3] This phenomenon in the interview data was first identified by Cohn and reported in Cohn et al. (1987) as well as in Cohn and Kottkamp (1993). Further discussion appears in Chapter 7.

> student with the assistant principal, the AP will look at you and say, basically, "This young man says he didn't do it. Why are you lying to me?" (73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./Health)

In this case, the teacher's mandate to exercise authority was directly undermined. The student's word had greater authority than the teacher's.

Problems such as this may characterize schools with a weak administration that essentially has no control. In the same school mentioned in this example, the Black football players staged a walkout after the team's coach told two starting players that they could not play because they had missed a week of practice with no good reason. The principal then countermanded the coach's authority by telling him to reinstate both players. As William described the subsequent developments, there were

> tremors, all through that season, culminating in the final game. That was in the playoffs, where the coach called one play the quarterback called a different one, and fumbled the ball. The other team got it and ran 60 yards for a touchdown with 15 seconds left on the clock. So we lost the game. The Black players afterwards decided that it was the coaching staff's fault. The coach accepted the blame because he didn't want all the blame put on this young man. (73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./Health)

William also described how the students "rioted" after the game, throwing helmets at people and violating acceptable rules and procedures.

Many of the teachers in this group said that the mandate to exercise authority had been lost in recent years. When authority ceased to function, it did not do so in isolated instances. This point also is connected to the anthropogogical view that authority is borne by a community rather than by individual teachers. Complaints among our Type 2 interviewees included comments such as Harry's: "[T]here's no respect for the job. . . . You really have to love the job to sit . . . and take this kind of stuff." Harry also characterized the major problem faced by the profession as related to the "loss of respect that society has for us especially. It's really heartbreaking to me that these people don't respect me 'cause they're talking about my profession" (29, M, B, Sr/M, Soc.Stud./Civ./Gov.). Garry described himself as a nurturer who tended to children's needs in much the same way as a gardener took care of flowers and other plants. He reflected on how many parents had changed in recent years; often they were "belligerent" in dealing with him as a teacher:

> Immediately, when they talk about their child being in trouble, they want to blame you, and this was never heard of 28 years ago. . . . I think that to summarize, I could say that the role of the parent has changed and the reaction that you get from the parent is different. (23, M, W, Jr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

William stated that he and other teachers felt that during the last few years, discipline and cooperation with students and their parents had grown progressively worse. He recounted how much the teachers' expectations differed from those of many parents:

> We had one young lady that refused to wear a bra and did not like to button her shirt. She was very well endowed. . . . We got her mother in for a conference because she refused to dress appropriately and her mother came in with bright blue hair, dressed exactly the same as her daughter, and did not think it was inappropriate.(73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./Health)

As indicated earlier, many of our interviewees spoke of parents who did not respect the teachers' authority and of administrators who contradicted teachers in their work. This is evident in the comments of Roberta, who communicated a strong sense of alienation and isolation. She felt that the teachers received "their commands from higher up" from people who had little or no idea of what it is really like to be in the classroom. She said, "Everybody is giving us suggestions, objectives, and then . . . whenever they've been here they don't really know what's going on" (59, F, B, Jr/H, Spec.Ed./L.D.). For her, the question is "Who gives the mandate to exercise authority?"

Type 2 teachers had not given up on the system as a support to their personal exercise of authority, but they believed that a more definitive sense of authority had to be reestablished between themselves and those with whom they worked in educating children. This authority could come from a better functioning administration, and, most importantly, from parents and students who were willing to respect their anthropogogical status by working together for a better environment of learning. These ideas were expressed by Olivia, who argued that the first thing that had to be done was to "give a little more authority to the teachers." In her words, "teachers would like to see a school . . . [in which] everybody is working for good discipline, and more support for the teacher" (53, F, H, Jr/L, Gen.Math.). For this teacher, authority represented an anthropogogical process of "learning to collaborate" (Benne, 1970, p. 409), drawing not only on her own efforts as a teacher, but also on

those of the students she taught, their parents and the administrators who ran her school.

EXPERT AUTHORITY AND TEACHERS WHO SEEK THE FREEDOM TO CREATE MICROWORLDS

Type 3 teachers, those who seek freedom to create microworlds, feel that they, like any expert authority, know best how to work and wish to be left alone as much as possible. They cope with the pressures of life and the teaching profession by creating a limited and self-defined "microworld." In terms of authority, these teachers act as experts. They expect others to grant them the authority to create a microworld for the betterment of their students. They may or may not be expert in subject matter, but they perceive themselves as having an expert knowledge of the appropriate teaching environment. On the basis of this perception, they demand absolute control of their own environment. As a group, these teachers call for control over both their work and their students. Brian explained how, at the beginning of the school year:

> You have to get in there and demand respect right away. . . . I was friendly, but I didn't smile much. I wasn't inconsiderate, but I laid down the law. Then they knew who was going to be boss right from the start. . . . You have to be tough, have to be on top of them all the time. (07, M, W, Sr/L, Gen.Sci.)

This teacher tacitly assumed that authority exists. It is up to the students to understand the boundaries of the microworld that the teacher is defining. Brian also stated:

> But it's really up to them, it's totally up to them whether or not, or how, I act. They know what I want, they know what I expect, and when they overstep the boundary then I can be a mean person. But if they don't . . . I can be a very pleasant person too at the same time. (07, M, W, Sr/L, Gen.Sci.)

A personally determined understanding of expertise in subject matter was an important in the definition of Brian's microworld and environment. Curricular guidelines required that he spend only a limited amount of time on the subject area that he considered to be his main specialty. Even so, Brian spent more than the allotted time on life sciences, his main area, seemingly in the belief "that his stu-

dents wish to be helped to become members of his own specialist community" (Benne, 1970, p. 396). As he put it:

> I love it, I just love life science that includes anatomy and physiology. I teach it—it's not in the curriculum. Most teachers spend maybe a couple or three [weeks]. I spend a whole amount of weeks on it just because I know a lot about it. I can be confident about it, I have a lot of material that I can give them, I have a lot of transparencies, I have a lot of handouts, a lot of models and things like that I use there, so I'm generally going to spend that much more time in there. (07, M, W, Sr/L, Gen.Sci.)

Brian can violate rules and traditions to suit his own desires and needs. The subject matter discussed in class was based largely on expert authority pertaining to the type of microworld he wished to create. Brian agreed to conform to the dictates of others only if such conformity fit his primary interests, or was part of a minimal compliance. Anything else would undermine him as "bearer of authority" (Benne, 1970, p. 384)—that is, as an expert.

> Right now we're talking [about] arthropods and sort of insects and crayfish. We're going into that for our next dissection. Of course, right at the beginning of the year I got over what I thought was probably the worst of it all . . . and that was a little bit of chemistry that you had to know, some biological chemistry that they had to go through. But I just like to talk about living things because I can relate a lot of personal experiences. (07, M, W, Sr/L, Gen.Sci.)

Maintaining authority, and ultimately control, is a serious issue for these Type 3 teachers. It does not necessarily come easily. Richard, for example, stated: "These kids today are pretty slick. They know what is going on. And you have got to outthink them" (60, M, W, Elem/L, Phys.Ed.). Decisions from outside—good or bad—are dismissed if they do not conform to the construction of reality defined by the teacher, especially if those decisions reduce students' "dependence" (Benne, 1970, p. 394) on the teacher. Of all of the teachers we interviewed for this research, Diane impressed us as the most protective of her environment and most in need of exerting control and her special brand of expert authority:

> It seems that the people that make these boxes up and think that this is good for children, they just want control. This is the best setting to control people. There's no teacher decision. There's no academic freedom. There's no creative teaching. They don't encourage the children to

> think critically. . . . I think some children, if the country was being attacked, . . . wouldn't know what to do because they don't even know how to think. They don't know the difference between democracy or fascism or communism. (19, F, W, Elem/H, 3rd)

The idiosyncratic microworld that Diane created in her classroom was the only possible reality for her. Even while she objected to people's making up boxes to control and shape the world in ways they considered most suitable, Diane seemed to be unaware that she was creating "boxes" of her own. Believing in her own expertise, she did not like the dependency created by other people's boxes but was more than willing to foster dependency in her own classroom.

Some of our respondents establish and defend their microworlds with almost a ferocious intensity. This was clear in an interview with Harriet. After teaching for 5 years, she left the profession for a year and then returned to teaching. During her interview to be rehired, she became convinced that she had the job. As she recalled the situation:

> [S]he was interviewing me and she was ridiculous, giving me all these numbers and ratios. It was lunch time at the school and the kids were—I couldn't even hear her—bouncing off the walls in the cafeteria, and I knew I had the job. I knew it right away. I was every principal's dream in the inner city. (26, F, W, Elem/L, 4th)

Describing herself in almost messianic terms, Harriet explained how she was "just made in heaven" for the principal's needs. She saw herself as possessing a "specialized ability" (Benne, 1970, p. 395). Thus she would bring authority to the midst of chaos.

The need to establish a closed, controllable microworld became evident in Harriet's story when she described her first few days in a new school. She was placed with two other teachers in an open classroom; she characterized one of these teachers as a "screamer." Even though she had been in the school for only 3 days, Harriet went to the principal and explained that if there was a storage closet, she would take it and move herself and her 15 students into it. She needed the "field" (Benne, 1970, p. 395) in which her competence and her students' needs could interact successfully.

Everyone had to conform to Harriet's exclusive, expert sense of the universe and the microworld she had created. Hers was the only authority, the only point of view. When challenged about the fact that she chewed gum in class, for example, she related that she told the student:

> Look, here's the deal. Every other Friday (the principal) gives me a paycheck. When she gives you one every other Friday, you too can chew gum. End of conversation! Like I'm the teacher. I always have a drink at my desk. I drink coffee all morning and I drink my soft drinks in the afternoon. And if I'm hungry I'll eat. (26, F, W, Elem/L, 4th)

Rules exist only to maintain this microworld and to maintain a situation in which students "are subjects of the authority of experts" (Benne, 1970, p. 394). Because Harriet was the bearer of authority and students were the subjects, she could issue dicta such as "There's rules in life, and one of the rules in school is that kids don't chew gum. Period! Finished!" (26, F, W, Elem/L, 4th).

Harriet called quickly on the authority of rules when they helped to define the boundaries and parameters of her intensely personalized, self-constructed, rationalized microworld. When the rules did not fit her construction of reality, however, she blatantly ignored them. As she pointed out, "I bend the rules and regulations. I prefer them not to be so stringent." Harriet redefined the rules to suit her own needs. She did so to maintain students' dependency on her and to preserve a differentiation between subject and bearer of authority.

Harriet often employed intimidation and a personal authority based on blatant aggression and manipulation. In dealing with her school's administration, she said:

> I'm not really outspoken to my administrators. . . . I really am not. I really listen to them and do what I want, and they sometimes shake their head, but they won't say anything to me either because in a school like mine, you're okay . . . since you don't send your kids to the office. (26, F, W, Elem/L, 4th)

Insight into her true nature as a colleague and a teacher was beyond Harriet's comprehension. Anthropogogical authority—empathy with the principal and other members of the staff—was not part of her vocabulary: "I am a dream for my principal. I cause her no aggravation. She has no parent complaints about me. I don't send children to the office. When paperwork is to be in by 3:00 Thursday, it's in by 2:30 Thursday" (26, F, W, Elem/L, 4th). One is tempted to ask her principal, "Is Harriet 'a dream' to work with?"

Anthropogogical authority, as found among Type 1 and 2 teachers, was not even perceived by Harriet as an issue, and seemed to be only a minimal issue for the other Type 3 teachers. Teachers with this disposition seemed largely unable to communicate with either parents or students whose values did not encompass their microworld—

that is, who did not accept dependence on the teacher or the teacher's "expertise in special processes" (Benne, 1970, p. 394). Leo, for example, commented:

> I called up a mother this year, so help me God, and I said, "Ma'am, you know, your son didn't do his first book report for the year. If he keeps on not doing them he's going to fail." And [the mother said] "Heck, my son, he ain't never read a book in his life, I ain't read too many myself and I ain't got no problem livin'." Well, how do you deal with that? That's nice, but he has to do it anyway. It isn't anything more complicated than that. (37, M, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts)

This statement and other parts of Leo's interview do not convey so much that he is wrong, but that in trying to communicate his concerns he lacks insight into the psychology or the culture of the parent with whom he is talking. As a result, there is no possibility of establishing any anthropogogical authority in his dealings with either the student or the parent. As an expert, Leo believes, his role as bearer of authority should be a given, not something to be negotiated.

This lack of anthropogogical insight was even clearer when Leo discussed students who were excused from class to attend athletic competitions. Once again, his concerns were not without cause, but he lacked empathy or understanding of the important role that athletics may play in those students' lives:

> [T]he games are scheduled too early, so the kids have to leave fifth hour. Now when you miss fifth and sixth hour continuously and your grades drop, you're hurting yourself. I have nothing against athletics; I'm totally non-athletic. I have no interest in athletics . . . and I also don't feel like it's my responsibility to make sure that they can make up the work, because that's not my choice that they leave. (37, M, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts)

Leo had decided that what students did in athletics had no meaning for him and could be ignored because it was not his "choice that they leave." In making that choice, the students exercised an independence that questioned the "extent they are subjects of the authority of experts" (Benne, 1970, p. 394). In this case, Leo was the expert.

Some of the teachers we characterized as seeking the freedom to create microworlds almost certainly turned to teaching to escape from a harsh external world into a world that they could control and define. Stanley, for example, was a scientist whose research grants were cut during the Nixon administration. He wanted to stay in Miami, and looked for work in the public schools. In time, he came to focus most of his attention on developing a video studio for his

school. He gained his satisfaction not from working in the classroom, but from creating his own microworld—that is, a forum in which he had to be recognized as an expert.

> I must submit that part of my satisfaction from the job comes [from the fact] that I don't have to spend full time in the classroom, that I have this alternative thing that allows me to look into electronics and learn the new machines and the systems and so on, and that I don't have to spend a hundred percent time in the classroom. (65, M, W, Jr/H, Sci.Bio.)

Despite Type 3 teachers' struggles to create dependency and recognition of their expertise, Benne (1970) argued that "an educator does not, because he cannot, command or physically coerce those for whose development he is responsible, be they called pupils or colleagues" (p. 401). The Type 3 teachers exercise the authority of their expertise to suit their own needs by creating a personal microworld, pervert the rules of authority to maintain their own self-centered construction of reality, largely ignore the role of anthropogogical authority, and show little sensitivity to the students they teach or the teachers and administrators with whom they work. In their desire to establish one of the principal characteristics of expert authority, namely, a persistent differentiation of function and specialized ability between bearer and subject, they fail to establish the other principal characteristic, namely a field of endeavor "tested against objective factors and forces" (Benne, 1970, p. 395).

RULE AUTHORITY AND THOSE WHO TEACH BY HAPPENSTANCE

Five of our interviewees regarded their authority as derived from physical discipline and control. On the basis of their descriptions, they were clearly ineffective and lacked control. They drew on neither expert knowledge nor anthropogogical authority in their work as teachers. These teachers seemed to desperately want a set of rules to follow, but had difficulty in recognizing such rules and in following them when they existed. In Chapter 3 we identified these five teachers as belonging to Type 4—teaching by happenstance. These teachers possessed a consistent set of attitudes about authority as well as consistent expectations about freedom.

In this context, Clara described a good day as a day when no one was disturbing her:

> And like the aide comes in and I explain to her what I want her to do. Now she knows exactly what I like for her to do and that is to read orally with the students, even though they're not allowed to do that anymore. They believe that you should have the kids read silently and then you ask them questions about what they read. Because the kids are so low in here I have her read orally along with them. To just move right along, from reading straight into English, when there is no argument. I know I'm wrong but a lot of times I don't have them raise their hand because I know them and I know how they react if you holler out at them. I'm a parent and I don't like people hollering at my kids, but if that's what it takes to make them settle down, then, fine. We go straight on into our lessons, and we have good feelings in this classroom, except for certain people, and I guess that's to be expected in each classroom. (16, F, B, Elem/M, Intermediate)

She also described a bad day:

> When we come in and have to go back outside, come back inside, sit down, and everybody is saying, "I don't understand this," constantly, all day long, to the same child. You have to tell them to go into the corner, sit down, and do your work. Someone comes in and decides that this is not a good day for me, and the whole class is totally gone. (16, F, B, Elem/M, Intermediate)

Clara had no sense of the rules that governed her ability to function effectively in the classroom and that might have provided her with a foundation for her personal authority as a teacher. She was a victim who had no control over her own work, no sense of her own authority. Someone could come into her classroom and decide that "this is not a good day for me." This statement is related to a fact of rule authority: "Without the consentient will of particular players to abide by the rules, no game would take place" (Benne, 1970, p. 397).

Clara did not like hollering, but would holler in order to establish her authority "if that's what it takes to make them settle down." Implicit in her interview was the constant threat of violence, of the need to exercise physical discipline in order to establish authority and control. This theme was repeated in the interviews of four of the five teachers we characterized as Type 4 and who were teaching by happenstance. Each sought a way to establish basic order. When order becomes a value greater than other values, however, "the enforcement of rules of conduct, and indeed of belief, tends to become a predominant strategy of management and control" (Benne, 1970, p. 397).

The desire to resort to physical discipline to establish order was evident in the comments of Rita, for example, who complained about

students' temper tantrums and the need to keep students quiet: "These days it's like your hands are tied as far as discipline in the room. You can only talk to them; you can't touch them" (58, F, B, Elem/L, Kindergarten). Rita believed overwhelmingly that at her school some children needed to be paddled, but that her hands were "tied" because she could not exercise authority through force. She described her ideal principal as "someone who's strong in discipline." Having worked under two different principals, Rita described at length how she particularly admired the first principal, whose authority was clearly derived from her power as a disciplinarian: "All the kids had to do was to see her and that was it, they would settle down" (58, F, B, Elem/L, Kindergarten). In describing her second principal, Rita stated that this administrator's physical authority was less evident—and thus, in Rita's estimation, so were her personal authority and effectiveness. The principal who supported her demonstrated to her and her students that the authority of classroom rules "rests on a wider consensus than that of any group now playing" (Benne, 1970, p. 397).

Rita was clearly confused as to what her role, her principal's role, and parents' role should be. Although she wanted a principal like her old one, who exercised a great deal of physical authority and discipline, she also made it clear that "the school board really gives the principal too much authority" (58, F, B, Elem/L, Kindergarten). Parents were a threat to her: "[T]hey get prejudiced against you because of the standard that you have as far as your educational method." In dealing with parents, Rita said, "[Y]ou can't say anything to them." The interview made clear that Rita felt she had to be extraordinarily careful about anything she said to a parent because it could be used against her later. She clearly had no sense of authority in what she did or said.

In the end, Rita's solution to the problems posed by the need to understand and exercise authority was to withdraw. She said, "I don't want to be in the classroom in the next five years. I'm thinking of going into counseling" (58, F, B, Elem/L, Kindergarten). Even though Rita wanted rule authority, she appeared not to understand a basic premise of such authority: "The function of rules is to create a system of orderly transactions among participants in joint action" (Benne, 1970, p. 397). She spoke of seeking solutions to individual problems, rather than a system of transactions.

Teachers we identified as most lacking a sense of freedom—teachers who were teaching by happenstance—sought solutions to their problems in a rule authority outside themselves. Maria commented, for example, "When you have a disruptive child all day long and you

send him to the office and nothing's done about it, you know, it discourages—I don't even send a child to the office, you know. It's like you make a fool of yourself" (43, F, B, Elem/M, 4th). Maria also conveyed a vague sense that physical discipline is not sufficient for establishing one's authority as a teacher. She grasped the possibilities of anthropogogical authority only barely and imperfectly:

> Well, first you have to be real firm with them. You know, you just can't do this. Let them know. I said, "Now, you let me talk and you listen to me and then when I'm finished I'm going to listen to you." You know, you have to be real firm. And you have to be in control, in command, and once they understand that, you don't have to be a tiger, but kids understand it. (43, F, B, Elem/M, 4th)

None of the Type 4 teachers had any sense of how anthropogogical or expert types of authority functioned, or how to obtain and maintain them effectively and meaningfully. They simply hoped that happenstance would provide a bearer of rule authority to get them through the day. In their game, they sought an effective umpire or referee.

Although nearly all of our 73 interviewees were asked questions about teachers they admired or who served as role models for them, almost none of the Type 3 or Type 4 individuals described such teachers. This may well be an aspect of the Type 4 teachers' nearly total rootlessness, and it may reflect the Type 3 teachers' self-absorption and self-centeredness.

THE AUTHORITY TO TEACH EFFECTIVELY

All of the teachers seemed to feel that they needed to work at authority or strive to attain it. Even though it related to possession or acquisition of personal qualities or the knowledge necessary to do their work, the teachers we interviewed expended considerable effort in their day-to-day activities to demonstrate the authority necessary for effective teaching. Type 4 teachers, facing daily happenstance, spent significant amounts of time in trying to discover personal authority. Type 1, 2, and 3 teachers felt it necessary to demonstrate to students and parents the authority that they already possessed. These teachers found it relatively easy to identify the type of authority they needed to exercise to be effective. It was more difficult, in their experience, to actually be effective. The survey data of this study reveal teachers' sense of how easily they assessed their effectiveness (see Table 5.1).

LD U

Table 5.1
Teachers' Views of the Ease of Assessing Their Own Effectiveness

	1964 %	1984 %
It is *relatively* easy to know when one is really teaching effectively.	45.6	52.0
It is possible to know one's own effectiveness *at times*.	48.7	43.9
It is *relatively difficult* to know when one is really teaching effectively.	5.6	4.1

Note. From Kottkamp et al. (1986c).

In the 20 years between Lortie's original survey and our study, the teachers seemed to become more confident about their ability to know when they were effective.

That is only part of the story, however. Just as our respondents were overwhelmingly confident in their own authority to teach, they spoke of the struggle to earn students' respect and told how the importance of their work had been rejected by students and their parents. The teachers said they had to win respect and overcome rejection of their work in order to be effective and gain proper recognition for their authority. These teachers found it increasingly difficult to win "willing obedience from subjects" (Benne, 1970, p. 393). In their attempts to assert authority, they had come to rely on factors in addition to their own judgment. Their self-confidence, now supported by external testimony to their authority and effectiveness, is evident in the survey figures displayed in Table 5.2. Although the teachers assessed their effectiveness easily in 1984, they also relied more strongly on outside indicators.

Table 5.2
The Indicator That a Good Teacher Is Most Likely to Use in Judging Personal Effectiveness

	1964 %	1984 %
Reactions of other teachers familiar with their work and students	11.7	16.3
Opinions expressed by students generally	7.4	11.1
Self-assessment: General observations of students in light of the teacher's conception of what should be learned	58.9	37.3
Assessments made by the principal	2.9	6.0
Assessments made by a "supervisor" or similar person	1.2	2.8
Results of objective examinations and various other tests	13.4	18.6
Reactions of students' parents	1.2	2.7
Other	3.3	5.3

Note. From Kottkamp et al. (1986c).

In the 20 years between the two surveys, teachers have come to rely increasingly on factors beyond their own judgment. We found a 21.6 percentage-point shift away from self-assessment of effectiveness. We believe that the difficulties teachers find in establishing and maintaining their authority are leading them increasingly to use indicators of effectiveness beyond their own judgment. The authority that they believe they possess must be demonstrated, especially to others, by more than personal assessment and testimony.

STRAINS ON THE STABILITY OF THE ETHOS OF TEACHING

Authority was an important issue among the teachers in all of our four groups: They delineated and described it at great length. Authority—and whether they possessed it—appeared to virtually all of our interviewees to play a critical role in whether they could function effectively in their work. Type 1 and 2 teachers exercised various degrees of anthropogogical authority through personal combinations of concern for students and for subject matter. Type 3 teachers had an extremely fragile expert authority based on the limited and circumscribed microworlds that they created for themselves and their students. The teachers in Type 4 desired rule authority, but had virtually no authority and little or no idea of how to obtain it.

These four types of teachers spoke in individual terms about their struggle to exercise authority. Even when they spoke of a societal or systemwide issue, they referred to their individual experiences. The orientation to individualism exacerbates this struggle. According to Lortie (1975):

> The individualism of teacher socialization also creates subjective problems for members of the occupation. People in other lines of work also have occasion to doubt their personal efficacy and the value of the services they offer. But in fields where people perceive their knowledge (and their ignorance) as jointly shared, the individual burden is reduced. . . . Thus the individual can cope with unpleasant outcomes by sharing the weight of failure and guilt; his inadequacy is part of the larger inadequacy of the field. Teachers derive little consolation from this source; an individualistic conception of practice exacerbates the burden of failure. (p. 81)

The authority with which all these teachers function is highly variable and shifting. The cultural forces of the past three decades

have created a climate in the schools that tends to contradict much of the authority traditionally given to teachers.

Teachers in Type 1 are faced with increasingly complex situations in which to test and exercise their anthropogogical authority. The changing ethos of schooling has created a more difficult set of conditions in which they must establish this authority. In Dade County, for example, teachers must confront not only diverse ethnic and racial groups, but also complex subgroups within these populations. Thus, "Black" can mean Haitian, Bahamian, Jamaican, northern urban, southern agricultural, or African. "Hispanic" can mean Cuban (pre- or post-Mariel), Colombian, Salvadoran, Nicaraguan, and so on. Not only must new traditions and groups be understood; they must be balanced and weighed against one another as each individual teacher deals with the dynamics of the classroom, the school, and the community.

Type 2 teachers also have encountered challenges to their brand of anthropogogical authority because of the rise of competing sources of knowledge and culture that are part of the development of the new ethos of schooling. Their subject matter is less sacrosanct today than it was two or three decades ago. Alternative forms of knowledge provided by the media and other forms of popular culture challenge the importance of their traditional subject matter and their ability to communicate that subject matter; in turn, the basis of their individual authority is challenged.

Type 3 teachers, because they are subject to greater scrutiny through efforts for accountability and other intrusions into their classrooms, are now less able to maintain their isolated microworlds. Each individual teacher's authority as an expert on the necessary learning environment, which has always been fragile and limited, is subject to more tests and challenges than ever before.

Finally, for the Type 4 teachers, the protections provided by the civil rights movement have made it more difficult—if not impossible—as a rule authority maintained by force. This loss is potentially important to these teachers because as a group, they have so few means of exercising their authority.

All of the teachers, no matter what their type, whether they are working in Dade County or elsewhere across the country, face the same universals. They must establish minimal order; they must gain the trust of the students, parents, and community they serve; and they must engage and motivate their students through the subjects they teach. In Benne's (1970) words:

> The bearer of authority receives willing obedience from the subjects of his (or its) authority as the bearer exercises his (or its) claim to help

> mediate the field of conduct or belief in which the subjects are in need of advice, leadership, guidance or direction. (p. 393)

Changes in the ethos of schooling since the early 1960s have made these tasks increasingly difficult.

Similarly in the problems they experience, our interviewees spoke of a reality wherein teachers' traditional authority was being redefined as a result of strains related to the changing ethos of schooling. Despite an orientation toward conservatism, the predominance of an anthropogogical understanding of authority seems to allow for dealing with the social reality of authority in schools. Whereas conservatism can reduce the power to change situations, anthropogogical approaches to authority enable a social response to change.

This change in the ethos of schooling as a societal phenomenon is a systemwide reality. Thus, the new ethos of schooling is creating a new culture in schools. It is no surprise that teachers who seek to create anthropogogical authority feel strains resulting from the reality of that change. Such authority derives from the group relations found in culture. In the next chapter we examine how teachers' concerns about the ethos of schooling can be viewed as a concern about the formation of a new school culture. In this regard we find the metaphor of "culture" used in the next chapter to be an apt expression for the relations fostered in schools by the ethos of schooling.

6

Teachers' Authority in the New School Culture

In the previous chapter we related teachers' notions of freedom to their conceptions of authority in order to show more clearly how different types of teachers perceive teaching relations in schools as part of their everyday reality. All of the teachers presumed a context underlying their relations with others in regard to schooling. Values that they assumed to be held by other teachers, parents, students, and the system of schooling provided such a context, in which they exercised authority. The occasional absence of "commonly held" values created unstable and problematic working situations.

Any group or organization working together with commonly held values can be understood as a culture. Morgan observed:

> Shared meaning, shared understanding, and shared sense making are all different ways of describing culture. In talking about culture we are really talking about a process of reality construction that allows people to see and understand particular events, actions, objects, utterances, or situations in distinctive ways. These patterns of understanding also provide a basis for making one's own behavior sensible and meaningful. (p. 128)

We believe that a sense of a school as a culture is the teachers' underlying metaphorical understanding with respect to the school as a whole. In the last chapter we outlined how teachers identified predominantly with anthropogogical authority. School as a culture is an apt metaphor for their interest in such authority because, according to Benne (1970), proper implementation of such authority

> prevents us from falling into the trap of automatically thinking of education as the transmission of culture to primitive and barbaric people by those already enculturated, rather than as the mutual renewal and reconstruction of persons-in-cultures. (p. 400)

Drawing on Lortie's (1975) work in *Schoolteacher*, we believe that the ethos of teaching has remained constant, producing a stable set of teachers' attitudes and orientations across time. Thus it is not surprising that teachers expect the school to be a culture of shared meaning, shared understanding, and shared sense making. In that culture they wish to find stable attitudes and orientations among the students, their parents, and those who direct the schooling.

The culture that teachers identify is connected more to work than to racial, ethnic, or social group understanding. Apparently they do not expect these relations to extend to their social and personal worlds outside school. Accordingly, the most immediate effects of the changes in the ethos of schooling as identified by the teachers are found in work relations.

We analyze how teachers describe the culture they imagine a school to be, and how they define themselves and their work within schools, in reference to what we call the changing ethos of schooling. As a result of this changing ethos, public schools since the early 1960s have become significantly more integrated as to their constituents' race, ethnicity, ability level, and economic situation. We begin our analysis by examining how teachers idealize the culture that schools supposedly passed in the past.

CULTURE AND THE "GOLDEN AGE OF SCHOOLING"

Throughout our interviews we sensed a tension between the ideal of common purpose in schooling and the reality of the teachers' experience. Many of our interviewees said with conviction that schools recently had become more difficult places to work—that they differed fundamentally from the schools they had attended as children. In the interim the school had lost its sense of certainty—that is, the common values making it a culture.

For many of our respondents, respect for the teacher was the element that had diminished most since they went to school. In the school culture of the past, the teacher as lead worker was respected. Alice, for example, reflected wistfully, "When I was in school, there was a lot more respect. The parents respected the teachers and the

kids respected the teachers" (01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.). If there was a problem in the school, the student rather than the teacher was held responsible. Only on the rarest occasion was the teacher's authority challenged by parents or students. As Paula recalled:

> When I was a student—and I'm talking about elementary school or junior high—if anything went wrong in the classroom, academically or behaviorally, the teacher was right and I was wrong. I'm not saying that that's necessarily all good or all bad, but there was a respect for teachers. (56, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten)

Catherine likewise described the school that she attended in the 1940s as a simpler workplace and, by implication, a better workplace. It was unencumbered by elements that destabilized the culture, such as extra teachers, discipline problems, students with special needs, and desegregation:

> I was born in '38, so here I am in elementary school in the forties. I went to a school that had one room of first grade, one room of second grade, and one room of third grade. One teacher, there were no music teachers; there was a P.E. teacher if you were in seventh and eighth grade. I was accustomed to a teacher teaching 20 or 25 students. There weren't any extra helpers around. There were no discipline problems. I never heard anybody tell a teacher to shut up or [say] "I'm not going to do it." We sat in chairs that were fastened to the floor, and did what the teacher asked us to do. There weren't any special groups. This was during segregation time, too. There were all whites in my school. There was not very much violence, and I learned to speak . . . correctly. (13, F, W, Jr/L, 6th)

This comment is particularly revealing in light of our earlier discussion about the new ethos of schooling that emerged from the societal changes beginning in the 1960s. This teacher wanted to return to a school culture that was not complicated by recent questions of equity and pluralism.

The teachers we interviewed, however, were constantly brought face to face with changes in the ethos of schooling. They viewed these changes as originating in the larger society or culture. Somehow a new cultural and social model based on different values and belief systems had emerged in recent years. Those differences had undermined the stability of the school culture that had existed for teachers in the past. As Sharon commented:

> I think that society has changed today. There are just so many different problems that you never learn in college. Society is more different today than it ever was. Most people are thinking what rule they can break next—not to obey and listen. Everybody blames everything on the school system. But I think things need to start at home and they aren't. Parents are not taking the interest. (64, F, W, Elem/H, Spec.Ed./L.D.)

Paula expressed similar thoughts:

> Society has changed; everything has changed. We went from one parent working to two parents working just to exist. And there's the really big change: Johnny can't read anymore 'cause Johnny doesn't just live in a closet those first five years. Johnny has no background. That's where the biggest change has been. (56, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten)

Interestingly, some of our interviewees, such as Margaret, believed that parents unrealistically viewed life in schools as having changed very little since their own school days. Thus the teachers perceived that some of the people who contributed destabilizing factors did not understand the changes that they, themselves, had made in the school culture:

> Most of the adults assume that things are happening the way they were when *they* were in school, and my classroom is so different from when I was in school. I mean, if you spoke back to the teacher, or if you did anything, not only did the school kill you, your parents killed you. Everybody killed you. That is not happening now. And . . . I don't think the public is aware of that. I think they are making their decisions based on their experiences. (41, F, W, Jr/M, Basic Math)

The teachers made it clear that the changes that have occurred in the schools over the past two or three decades have made the schools significantly different from the institutions that the teachers remember attending as students. They were certain about the factors that have undermined the foundations of the school culture, which they recall from a "golden age of schooling." The changes include a decline in respect for school as a workplace through lessening of parental support, students' apathy toward work in general, the impact of television, a general lack of respect for the work teachers do, distrust of teachers due to greater demands for accountability, and problems related to changing school populations.

CULTURE AND THE LACK OF RESPECT FOR THE SCHOOL AS A WORKPLACE

As presented in our discussions of freedom and authority, our interviewees saw themselves circumscribed and limited in what they could achieve in the classroom by the attitudes of their students and the students' parents. They viewed parents' and students' attitudes as important in defining schools for them. In the past, those attitudes had made the school a culture—a workplace of common values and attitudes.

Many teachers criticized current parents because they believed they lacked motivation to participate in programs involving their children. Albert expressed his frustration as follows:

> You have to get the people more involved in schools. We had parents' night at school. It's embarrassing because nobody comes. We have a pretty good neighborhood out there—a lot of money. We cover a pretty good range. . . . They go through all kinds of methods to bring the parents in. We even try to find the right time when the average parent gets home from work, to try and find the right day, because you're not going to compete with Monday night football. It's crazy. Isn't that silly? You figure that your kid, your daughter, is more important. (02, M, H, Sr/H, Phys.Ed.)

Particularly as presented in our earlier discussion of authority, teachers felt that parents frequently did not attach priority to the work of schooling because of changing family values and realities, such as the growth in the number of dual-earner families, the increase in divorces, and the rise in the number of homes with working single parents.[1] Teachers recently have found it necessary to compete for parents' support for the work underway in schools. Ab-

---

[1] See U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census (1985). This report includes the following facts:

Since the 1960s the annual divorce rate in the United States has increased significantly. In 1985 there were 128 divorced individuals for every 1,000 married persons. In 1970 the figure was 47 per 1,000, and only 35 per 1,000 in 1960. These figures represent an increase of over 350% in the divorce rate between 1960 and 1985.

The living arrangements of children have also changed. Of 62.5 million children under age 18 in 1985, 14.6 million, or 23% lived with only one parent, in contrast to 12% in 1970 and 9% in 1960. In 1985, 9 out of 10 children living with only one parent lived with their mother. In that year, 54% of all Black children lived with one parent. This figure was 29% for Hispanic children and 18% for White children.

The increase in working mothers also must be noted. At the present, approximately 50% of all women work outside the home, roughly a fivefold increase since 1900. A particularly dramatic increase occurred between 1960 and 1980, when the proportion increased from approximately 30% to 50%. These figures are also outlined in Chapter 1.

sence of this support precludes the commonly held values that would qualify the school as a culture.

Parents' attitudes were not the only area showing a decline in general respect for the school as a workplace. Teachers spoke about students who were not especially interested in learning anything. Some of the teachers described school as more of a legal necessity than an opportunity for many of the children they taught. As Patricia recalled:

> When I first started teaching, children still wanted to learn. They still were excited to come to school. Kids now are there because they have to be there, and that's about it for a lot of them. There are still a few that want to learn. The majority of kids are there because they have to be there. It makes me wonder about our American school system. I wonder if we're keeping a lot of these kids beyond when they should be in school. Maybe we should go to some of the European systems where they finish school at the junior high level and apprentice out to some tradesman for the upper years. (55, F, W, Sr/L, Spec.Ed./V.E.)

Alice described her discussion with a fellow teacher about not being able to "reach her students." She reported that her colleague said to her, "It's not you. You're doing what works and it does work. What's happening is the kids aren't taking your facilitation and using it to the best advantage" (01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.). Reflecting on the situation, Alice told the interviewer that as far as her students were concerned, "school's not that important anymore. There's not too many after school activities, and those that are there are only for the good kids in the crowd" (01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.). How can the school be a culture if respect for "working" in school seems to be lacking?

In addition to the decline in respect for the school as a workplace, many teachers said they were experiencing more instances of disrespect for schooling and the value of learning as work than in the past. Discipline and the need to exercise control over students who were not interested in schooling were particular problems for secondary teachers. William described how:

> I'm finding less and less cooperation with parents and students in the classroom. Fewer and fewer want to do any assignment to keep up, no matter what you do. You say, "Look, get to class on time, you have five minutes to get from one door, walk 30 feet and come in the next one." Well, I have kids that will have 30 tardies and you can give them 2 hours in detention after school. They don't show. They're still late to class. . . . It seems to be increasing. I've never had so many. (73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./Health)

Karen related:

> My biggest problems in class again are discipline problems from students who are not really there to learn. They're there because there's a mandatory attendance policy. They disrupt the classes, and if they just sit there—if they're not doing the work—it's like a domino effect in the class. It's the constant "Okay, Johnny, take out your sheet of paper and let's start." . . . It's that energy that you give to the kids who don't really want it that you're taking away from the kids who really do want it. I think we're turning out a mediocre product where we could be turning out a good product if you get rid of the ones who don't really want your time for what you're trained to do. (35, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

These observations are common among teachers. They saw the need to affirm the school as a place where important things are done. To the teachers, disrespect demonstrated the students' presumption that there was nothing to respect. When disrespect was displayed regularly, how could a school be presumed to have the common values identified with the concept of culture in general and with a school culture more specifically?

Beside students' attitudes, our interviewees regarded television as a critical reason why many students were not engaged in the school culture. Mary, a high school science teacher, stated that when she began teaching 25 years ago, she did not have to worry about competing with "Mr. Wizard and television" (47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.). Most of the teachers' comments about television were related to this feeling that they had to compete. Garry corroborated the experience when he commented, "I think that television has had a very detrimental effect on the makeup of the children. Many children will complain that what you are doing is boring. It's not as exciting as what they see on television" (23, M, W, Jr/H, Lang. Arts/Eng). Throughout the interviews, the teachers said that it was impossible to compete with television in their day-to-day classroom work. Despite this impossibility, their comments implied that somehow the schools were expected to present material so as to make it as compelling as a television program. Many students expect that school must function like television to be valued as a meaningful place or culture. If such a change has taken place, then the meaning of the school and the work to be done there is being redefined.

Lack of parents' and students' involvement, and competition from alternate cultural and learning sources such as television, were cited as destabilizing the work of teaching, undermining the school as a

culture, and, by extension, making the schools and the students what they had become. In this connection, Donald expressed the problems and frustrations expressed by many of the teachers:

> Single-parent homes affect us, both parents working affects us, children left alone for long periods of time affect us. Parents won't help at home. They don't want to be bothered. Some kids come to school sick because there is nobody at home. Some kids stay home because there is no one that makes them get up and go to school. School has had to perform social and custodial duties, which is not fair. Parents are unable to discipline their own children. Parents don't guide their own children in many cases. The TV does that. Homes filled with noise, hunger, poverty, danger. We've heard that before. . . . Parents do not see to it that children get the right amount of sleep. There is lack of structure in their lives, and it makes it impossible for us to structure their lives in school. You can't take a kid who has no structure and make him sit for fifty minutes. TV, rock music are good. Drugs are not good. Kids do not work now to help the family. They work to support their cars, and their stereo, their clothes, and parents think that is a legitimate reason for not making them do the work. (18, M, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.)

CULTURE AND A LACK OF RESPECT FOR THE WORK OF TEACHING

The teachers said they felt that parents and society in general did not show them the respect appropriate to the important work they do. This issue of status was important for the teachers we interviewed: How much respect can exist for the school as a culture if the lead workers receive no respect for their occupation? This is a general occupational problem, as reflected by indicators such as the Gallup polls on the general public's attitudes toward public schooling. The polls asked parents whether or not they would like to see their child become a teacher. In 1969, 75% of all U.S. parents said they would be pleased if their children became teachers. This figure declined to 67% in 1972 (Gallup, 1978). In 1984, the year in which we began the interviews for this study, the Gallup poll asked the same question somewhat differently. Fifty percent of the respondents indicated that they would like to have a daughter of theirs teach; 46% stated that they would like to have their son teach (Gallup, 1984).

Many of the teachers we interviewed found it difficult to reconcile the lack of occupational respect they received from the general society with the responsibility they were given for shaping and molding future generations. Gertrude regarded herself as "literally affecting

hundreds of lives every year. But I don't think society perceives teachers as professionals anymore, and that's sad" (24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary). Harry expressed another sentiment about the lack of respect for teaching as an occupation:

> There's no respect for the job because we have to deal with a lot of things: personalities of 150 students and sometimes verbal abuse from students and . . . criticism—those kinds of things. You really have to love the job to sit here and take this kind of stuff. (29, M, B, Sr/M, Soc.Stud./Civ./Gov.)

Leo commented that the general public and the parents of his students were concerned only about their own needs—making "their next boat payment" or, among those from lower socioeconomic groups, having "enough food on the table." He declared, "Frankly, I don't think the public gives a damn, as a whole. I don't think the majority of people out there realize that we're doing something that the kids desperately need. We're preparing them for their whole future" (37, M, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts). In addition to feeling that parents and students were less connected to teachers' work and to the school as a culture than in the past, our interviewees reported that over the years, they had become less connected with the cultures (the shared values and meanings) of the communities in which they lived. They perceived less commitment to, and involvement with, teachers by people in the community. Garry reflected:

> I guess we are living in a world of strangers. When I began teaching 28 years ago in these small rural towns, everyone knew everyone else . . . if John did something wrong, the entire community knew about it, so you had the community pressure. You had peer pressure to do the right thing. Today I don't feel that you have peer pressure or community pressure to do the right thing. I think many of the children today feel that they can remain anonymous. (23, M, W, Jr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

Grant (1988) spoke of the teacher as a moral agent representing the community. Yet in regard to the new ethos of schooling, it has become much more problematic and more difficult to identify the shared values that the teacher actually represents in the culture of schools. With the increasing centralization of teaching, it has become increasingly difficult for teachers to draw on a community consensus that supports their efforts in the classroom.

Several of our respondents clearly recognized the importance of being rooted in the community culture. Agnes said:

> I've always lived in the community where I taught, and I still do. I found that there's so many things that we don't have to do because we live in the community. On your way home you see so many parents on the way. You tell them about Johnny. You don't have to phone them, or sometimes you can't. And you don't have to send home failure notices. You get more time to concentrate on teaching. (04, F, B, Jr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

Because they are largely unconnected to the cultures of the communities in which they teach, it is not surprising that our respondents described their work in the school's culture as undervalued by society. Repeatedly, they indicated that the worth of what they did was judged not in light of their working contribution to the culture or to the larger society, but on the basis of the money they were paid. Bonnie, an unmarried high school social studies teacher, reported that everyone she went out with asked her "Why are you teaching? How can you support yourself? What's wrong with you?" One of her dates, a lawyer, recalled that he had taught for a short period and had loved it, but felt that she was crazy to stay in the profession (10, F, W, Sr/M, Soc.Stud./His.). Society's failure to value teachers' work financially was a major problem for Bonnie. "Paying people less than mail carriers—what are you saying? We call it a profession. . . . It's really not a lot of times. The people who do it, do it at sacrifice" (10, F, W, Sr/M, Soc.Stud./His.). Low salaries were not the only issue for Bonnie. The low salaries reflected society's lack of respect for her work. One wonders whether salary was less of an issue when teachers were integrated more immediately into the cultures of the communities in which they taught—when their contribution perhaps was more immediate, more visible, and more respected. In such a time, a school would have been more obviously a culture.

SCHOOL CULTURE AND TEACHERS' ACCOUNTABILITY

Teachers described their schools as places where the quality of their work was suspect and where they were increasingly held accountable for what happened in the classroom, in regard to both discipline and instruction. At the same time, they were much more severely limited because of legal restrictions and because crucial parental and administrative support was not more forthcoming. Many of the interviewees saw themselves as dealing with circumstances beyond their control but being held accountable as if they were fully in control. Kelly asked:

> How do you hold a teacher accountable for whether or not a child learns when the child comes to school hungry? When the child comes to school tired? When the child comes to school so disturbed about things that have happened at home that there is no energy left in him? How do you hold a teacher accountable [for] whether or not the child learns? How do you hold a teacher accountable [for] whether or not her entire classroom learns when there is one child who is disrupting the whole classroom to the point that she can't focus on teaching, but is focusing on discipline—where a child has to be literally threatening the safety of everybody else before something is done about it? They are held accountable for teaching, but yet there are so many other things that don't pertain to the actual teaching process, that take their time and energy. It just seems to be a vicious round robin. (36, F, W, Elem/L, Spec.Ed./L.D.)

Roberta complained that "parents are leaving it basically up to the school system to handle what they [parents] should handle" (59, F, B, Jr/H,Spec.Ed./L.D.). Yet although they were given the responsibility to do more with the children they taught, many of the teachers believed that at the same time they were more liable to legal prosecution than in the past.

Some teachers felt threatened by the possibility of lawsuits. Ruth, for example, took out an insurance policy to protect herself against lawsuits from her students:

> If a kid fell off the monkey bars and broke their arm they would be inclined to sue you now, whereas at one time [they would] not. . . . You have to prove that you were there and you have done everything and you had instructed how to climb the monkey bars. . . . You don't put anything on a cumulative record anymore . . . it's ridiculous to put anything on because the parent has the right . . . to take anything off. But I was always very careful anyway what I put [on]. But now I pretty generally say "Marilyn achieved nicely in kindergarten." Some innocuous remark that means nothing, that is not going to . . . come back. But why should I even have to think of protecting myself from a legal standpoint? (61, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten)

Garry recalled that during his own career, disciplinary approaches that had been accepted, considered appropriate, and even viewed as desirable had become grounds for dismissal:

> When I first started teaching it was permissible and desirable for a teacher to paddle a student. Now, if a teacher paddles a student, it means their job—either a 30-day suspension or perhaps complete expulsion from the system. Many restrictions have been placed on the

> teacher. The teacher has to worry about the implications of lawsuits today because years ago, when I first started teaching—and perhaps they weren't right—but if, let's say, a teacher slapped a student . . . the teacher wouldn't have to worry about a lawsuit. This would be worked out between the parent and the teacher and the principal and the student. (23, M, W, Jr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

He added that now "there's a completely different approach. There's a lawsuit, maybe the expulsion of the teacher."

Other teachers reported that they avoided raising certain topics that they felt they should be teaching because of the threat of lawsuits. As Patricia said:

> I think that oftentimes you're afraid to say and do certain things that you feel the student may need to hear or may need to be exposed to because of all this business that has come along over the years. You're not allowed to say anything about God. You're not allowed to say anything about certain other things. You're really handicapped in what you can do and say, and I don't think that that's right. (55, F, W, Sr/L, Spec.Ed./V.E.)

Our respondents indicated that the actions of teachers in general were increasingly suspect. In the past, they had been allowed to exercise what was then considered reasonable corporal punishment; now they were threatened with dismissal for the same actions. Many of the teachers believed that the experience of the 1960s was responsible for the shift in attitudes about acceptable or unacceptable practice, whether corporal punishment or what teachers openly say in the classroom. Alice saw the change as "all coming out of the sixties. The rights, you know. Everybody having the right to this and the right to that—freedom of this and freedom of that" (01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.). Growing suspicion, threats, and circumscribed behavior do not seem to demonstrate a stable environment where commonly held values are in evidence. Therefore these demands for accountability indicate to teachers that their work and their workplace are not perceived as the culture they believe is necessary for effective teaching and learning.

CULTURE AND CHANGING SCHOOL POPULATIONS

Throughout the interviews, we found an overriding perception that the population of schoolchildren, and as a result the culture of the schools, had changed significantly. Probably the clearest cause of

change was the civil rights movement. Veteran teachers discussed the changes they had seen, and said that today they were dealing with populations whose needs, expectations, values, and sense of culture were different from those they had encountered when they began to teach. Younger teachers described how the schools differed from those of their own school days.

Changes in the population generated new activities, new demands, and schools that emphasized different values and work from those of the past. Alice recalled:

> A lot of things we used to do have gone down the drain with the changing population, with the change of boundaries, change of kids—kinds of kids that we had, and now that we do have. A lot of the things that used to be tradition, that kept the kids united and kept them in school, are no longer there. (01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.)

Evident in this statement was the awareness that the changes in population had redefined the traditional culture of the school. The old tradition of a united culture was lost. Logically this change would necessitate the creation of a new culture with its own traditions, symbols, and rituals. In light of the diversity of populations in the schools, however, this seemed very difficult to achieve. In addition, rules and procedures that were valued by a more homogeneous group no longer applied in a more complex and more diversified school. Agnes, for example, said that her school was no longer exclusively Black, and described how that change had altered the cultural values of the school in subtle ways:

> Now it's tri-ethnic, basically. A major part of the population is Hispanic. Black is still the predominant ethnic group, but not quite as it was before, and then you also have a significant number of white students in the school. . . . I hear people who were here at the time it was all black talk about the difference in the school in certain respects. For instance, certain things you probably would have said to a child then—[now] you have to be careful lest it sound racial or prejudicial in any way because it's no longer one ethnic school. There are certain things you are very cautious how you say it, how it gets across. (04, F, B, Jr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

Sensitivities toward different racial and ethnic groups made these teachers' work more complicated and sometimes problematic. Agnes described dealing with whether a child wanted "to be referred to as black or Hispanic" as a problem requiring discretion and involving

careful consultation: "You just don't go and write down . . . a person's ethnic group without consulting him" (04, F, B, Jr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.).

Desegregation not only brought together diverse ethnic and racial groups; it was also viewed by teachers, such as Alice, as detaching students from their cultures and from familiar social contexts:

> When you take a kid and you bus them seven, eight, nine miles to get them to a school you have to put them in an unreal situation for six, seven hours a day, and then you send them back to the same neighborhood they live in. It's not helping. Let's improve the schools where they live. . . . But you go ahead and you force children out of their neighborhoods [and] you create problems. (01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.)

Catherine recalled that she had left Florida before integration. When she returned to teach after the schools had been desegregated, she found that most of the students disrupting her class were Black. She was embarrassed and feared that she would be considered prejudiced by disciplining these students; she explained that she did not consider herself prejudiced except in favor of "the student who has to sit and learn and puts up with this" (13, F, W, Jr/L, 6th). For Nancy, the problem was that fundamental economic and class issues affected, in important ways, how children with significantly different values interacted with one another:

> [Many] of the behavior patterns from some of the poorer areas have been very different from the youngsters from the affluent areas that we've had around here. They've had to learn to adjust. [When] you put youngsters who have very little next to youngsters who have so much in terms of material possessions, you're creating conflicts. (49, F, W, Jr/M, Soc.Stud.)

Despite any deserved or undeserved charges of prejudice, these teachers' observations show clearly that they perceived themselves as dealing with new social groups and therefore new cultural understandings in the schools. Desegregation is part of the realization of a new pluralism in the schools—one that fosters a new ethos of schooling. Yet this new ethos has not necessarily diminished the prejudice and distrust among various ethnic and racial groups. Mary, for example, said that she thought desegregation had "had a big impact on a lot of people" from both the students' and the teachers' perspective. She believed, however, that latent prejudice was still widespread among both teachers and students and across the races and different ethnic groups (47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.).

Teachers who had lived through the desegregation process themselves as students were aware of how the culture of schools had changed as a result of desegregation. Roberta, a Black teacher, felt that she must have lost an opportunity to excel by being compelled to attend an integrated school:

> If I had graduated from a black high school, if I were not the salutatorian I would have been the valedictorian. I would have been in the top . . . but then when you go to an integrated situation then you're no longer the high person on the totem pole. There are so many people ahead of you. (59, F, B, Jr/H, Spec.Ed./L.D.)

According to Roberta, greater competition reduced the Black students' opportunities to excel.

Desegregation—even when people accepted it readily—was viewed consistently as a confounding value for teachers and for the schools. Joan expressed the situation quite clearly:

> Working with teachers that are black, that's never bothered me. The only thing that did bother me was when they forced integration. That was in the winter of '70, and they forcibly brought teachers in. Everybody came in with bad will. They were told, "You will go to white school. You will go to black school." I was teaching PE and they brought in three blacks into the PE department, and none of them wanted to be there. They felt as threatened as we felt having them come in, because we were losing three people that we cared about. One day we had three whites and the next day we had three blacks. So there were six people, and we were split right in half. I felt uptight about that, not from them as people, but the way they felt coming into it. (33, F, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.)

The impact of the civil rights movement extended beyond the introduction of new values related to race and ethnicity. Teachers described mainstreaming special students—particularly at the elementary level—as having affected their classrooms and schools day to day. Once again, the net result was a reduction in shared values related to work and a greater pluralism and diversity. The interviewees stated that the decrease in shared values related to a school culture had increased the difficulty and complexity in the classroom and in their work. Nancy recalled:

> Mainstreaming has added a little more difficultly into the classroom. We have the hearing-impaired in my school, so they mainstreamed a few hearing-impaired children into my classroom. I have to take each

> chapter and I have to outline all major concepts now on a board, so that the child has a visual as well as an auditory. That helps the slow learner. I found that is the best thing. You take each chapter. You outline it. You go over every sentence with them. They pick up the spelling a little bit better. They understand each concept. I create an outline mentally for them to understand the history as we're progressing. It's a lot of history and it's difficult for some of them to remember. So helping the hearing-impaired has also helped the slower learner. Then I had the honors and the gifted child on one side, and I have this one on this side, so we have everybody in the classroom. (49, F, W, Jr/M, Soc.Stud.)

Teachers who had never received any training in dealing with different values and different racial, ethnic, and ability groups suddenly found themselves working with students who had special needs. This created serious problems for many teachers. Agnes worried constantly about whether she was doing "the right thing by them" (04, F, B, Jr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.).

STRAINS RESULTING FROM WORKING BETWEEN THE OLD CULTURE AND THE NEW ETHOS OF SCHOOLING

In many ways the changes that teachers have experienced with the changing ethos of schooling are not new. They perceive the number of differences, however, as increasing to the point of being problematic. The changing ethos of schooling is making their goals in teaching more difficult to attain. As for the teachers in the 1960s, the instructional importance of their work remains, for our interviewees, "relatively traditional; they want to produce 'good' people—students who like learning—and they hope they will attain such goals with all their students" (Lortie, 1975, p. 132).

Because of the perception of greater lack of respect for the school as workplace, it is no wonder that teachers believe students' participation is diminishing. In the face of such a difficulty, it seems natural for teachers to look back to a "golden age of schooling," when there seemed to be a viable culture in schools. The teachers we interviewed who spoke of a well-remembered teacher did so in the same terms as did those interviewed by Lortie (1975) when speaking about situations. They remembered a setting in which "(1) the teacher produced affection and respect from students; (2) the teacher got work out of the students; and (3) the teacher was effective in win-

ning student compliance and discipline" (p. 118). Such characteristics are an apt definition of teachers' metaphorical understanding of schools as a culture. Further, what we call the "golden age of schooling" was a time and place in which these three circumstances, and the experience of a school culture that they represented, seemed much easier to achieve. Any new ethos of schooling must foster an atmosphere that encourages such outcomes for teachers and such a culture if it is to be accepted by the current teaching force.

For different types of teachers, these three circumstances of teachers' perceptions command different priorities. Type 3 teachers, those who seek freedom to create microworlds and who emphasize expert authority, place the highest priority on returning to the golden age of student "compliance." Type 4 teachers, those who teach by happenstance and who emphasize rule authority, seek a golden age of student "discipline."

In the face of a changing ethos of schooling, Type 1 teachers, those who seek the freedom to be student-centered and who emphasize anthropogogical authority, favor a golden age when "the teacher produced affection and respect." This changing ethos, however, seems to be producing a situation in which choices to create such an atmosphere are subject to greater pressure than in the past. In particular, the pressure to serve students of all races, colors, and creeds has increased, thus reducing the teachers' ability to choose effective ways of gaining affection and respect.

Type 2 teachers, those who seek the freedom of subject matter status and who (like Type 1 teachers) emphasize anthropogogical authority, favor a golden age when it was easier to get "work out of the students." Yet because of the changing ethos of schooling, emphasis on school as a respected workplace seems to be under greater pressure now than in the past. The influence of television and other media, as well as disrespect from parents and society in general, reduce the likelihood that teachers' will be able to get "work out of students."

Although the ethos of schooling has changed, the ethos of teaching does not readily lead teachers to change authority relationships. Often, to maintain some autonomy, both Type 1 and Type 2 teachers seem to make situational alliances rather than developing shared values. Teachers who want relief from intrusions by parents, poor student attitudes, and the threat of lawsuits feel that they are "suspect" when the system demands payment of the debt of protection in the form of greater compliance through accountability. To assert their authority in one situation they must concede it in another. In these concessions they feel more like students than like teachers in regard to authority relationships. Although they seek the lost culture of a

golden age of shared values, these teachers are forced to submit like children to accountability. In its perceived undermining of teachers' authority, accountability makes teachers feel that they are less than adult members of the school community.

Besides feeling reduced in stature, Type 1 and Type 2 teachers, who are interested in anthropogogical authority, do not seem to accept some of Benne's more recent observations about that authority. In the culture of shared values, he said all participants are learners. On reflecting about the settings animated by anthropogogical authority, Benne (1990) stated:

> What is required is rather a process of deeper reenculturation that involves the remaking of world views, value orientations, modes of civic participation, and the perception and valuation of self. We must learn to think of education in terms of anthropogogy, assisting the education of persons of all ages, not pedagogy alone. (p. 122)

Our interviewees seemed not to reflect on the classroom as a place where teachers learn. In the absence of an anthropogogical disposition toward themselves, maybe the accountability that teachers experience is forced reeducation. Teachers seem to be blind to their own continuing socialization with regard to further adaptation to the larger realities of society. As Benne (1990) also observed:

> Recognition of these broader dimensions of required adaptation is delayed by the stubborn persistence of the belief that socialization occurs only or primarily in children and adolescents, that it comes to an end with the advent of biological adulthood. This false assumption supports the traditional view that the central mission of education is pedagogy, not anthropogogy. (p. 122)

Further, teachers retain a hope in a past reality—the myth of the golden age of schooling. The school culture they described in various ways was always in the past. They spoke of the shared values as lost. Benne (1990), in commenting on the relation between what we call the old or founding ethos of schooling and the new ethos, stated:

> Within our nation, the melting-pot policy of Americanization of immigrant peoples, in the implementation of which the common school was to have played a crucial part, is demonstrably a failure. Divisions among unmeltably heterogeneous ethnic, racial, and religious groups are everywhere apparent. These divisions, augmented by pressure from groups organized along lines of differing genders, sexual preferences, academic disciplines, ages, vocations, have robbed the notion of a "com-

> mon interest" of any viable reality in matters of public policy, including policies for education. (p. 125)

Not that the notion of common interest has lost its viability; it is no surprise that the teachers expressed a sense of being robbed of their school culture. Even by their own accounts, such a culture is possible only with commonly held interests.

The difficulties that our teachers perceived on a macrolevel were related to school culture and authority, but they also felt that in the everyday reality of classrooms, they had to overcome difficulties simply in order to teach. These difficulties cause teachers to question, at times, whether they have the power to teach. In the next chapter we examine teachers' conceptions of having and not having such power. In the issue of power, the differences in types are not so strongly evident as in regard to freedom and authority. It seems that the ethos of teaching remains strong and stable with respect to understandings of teachers' power, but that the ability to enact that ethos constantly changes. The different types show us nuances regarding power; in the overall picture, however, all teachers must work daily to obtain the power that is necessary for teaching.

7

The Power to Teach

As teachers spoke about the freedom they desired and the authority necessary to teach, they also made clear that some of their relationships involved difficulties related to the power to teach. To fully understand and to contextualize concerns about freedom and authority, one must comprehend the power relationships involved in teaching. In our attempt to understand a concept such as power in the context of schooling, it was difficult to find detailed discussions of power relationships in education outside the work of scholars such as Apple (1979, 1982; Apple & Weiss, 1983) and Giroux (1981, 1983). These theorists, however, speak on the macrolevel about structures, ideologies, and hegemonies. The teachers we interviewed did not speak of their power relationships in these ways. They discussed the rewards and difficulties of working in the everyday world of events rather than in terms of the forces underlying these events. It seemed to us that we would be demanding too much of the data if we used these theorists and their explanations as ways of understanding the "talk" of the teachers we interviewed.

Nyberg (1981) posited that the scarcity of discussion about power in relation to education is due to a "denial of power" (p. 67). Many educators seem to think there is something wrong about power as an issue in education. Nyberg, however, believed "that thinking about education will be enriched by the redintegration[1] of power in educational philosophy" (p. 70). Because our interviewees identified power

[1] Nyberg (1981) explained the use of this unusual term as follows: " 'Redintegration' is a useful term that is seldom used. It carries the meaning of reconciliation and strong implication of a return to a condition of soundness, wholeness, and integrity" (p. 70).

relationships as a component of their work, it seems essential to understand power as they experienced and exercised it. Nyberg's (1981) understanding of the categories of power were helpful in our analysis because, in the words of the subtitle of his book, *Power over Power*, he aimed to understand "what power means in ordinary life, how it is related to acting freely, and what it can contribute to a renovated ethics of education." As we showed in previous chapters, the teachers we interviewed spoke about their everyday lives and discussed how they wanted to act freely with authority in educating students, rather than seeing themselves in an ideological or hegemonic struggle.

The categories that Nyberg (1981) identified as forms of power in ordinary life are force, fiction, finance, and fealty. Nyberg defined these categories as follows:

> Force. The most primitive and least stable form of power is that occurring when actual or threatened physical harm is used to force consent (obedience) from the otherwise unwilling. (p. 70)
>
> Fiction. The central task in the exercise of power is eliciting from others the consent necessary to put one's plan into effect. One can force consent with threatened or actual physical harm, but it can be won with words and ideas and images, too. A person who is good at using words to turn ideas into images in the minds of listeners and readers—a storyteller—is a person of great potential power. (p. 71)
>
> Finance. [F]inance is most easily understood and commonly recognized as an offer of reward for services made within the rules of some theory of economic exchange. The reward need not be money, but it must always be something valued by the one who performs the service, just as the service must be valued by the one who offers the reward. In short, cooperation is achieved by the exchange of costs and benefits. (p. 75)
>
> Fealty. Fealty (faithfulness or loyalty that is based on trust and mutuality) is close to love, and love is commonly thought to be not at all like power. . . . As power takes on forms that more and more closely approximate balanced trust, shared understanding, and a mutual plan for action, more and more of one's available resources are freed for application to the plan itself. . . . It is just here that power and love begin to merge in fealty as the most stable of all social schemes: reciprocal, cooperative commitment. (pp. 80–81)

Burbules (1986) viewed these four categories as corresponding roughly to those named by Boulding (1965) in his jingle:

Four things that give mankind a shove
Are threats, exchange, persuasion, love.

For our purposes, we use Boulding's terminology. Like Greene's technical terms, we found Nyberg's terms somewhat cumbersome, although alliterative. Thus, we use *threats* for Nyberg's "force," *persuasion* for Nyberg's "fiction," *exchange* for Nyberg's "finance," and *love* for Nyberg's "fealty."

TEACHERS' CONCEPTIONS OF POWER

In analyzing the interview data concerning teachers' conceptions of power, we focused on how teachers described their own power (or lack of power) in education according to Nyberg's overall descriptions. Sometimes teachers used the word *power* but did not describe it. We did not consider these statements containing "power" in our analysis because they did not express the nature or function of the power relation. In response to a probe from the interviewer, a teacher might identify a person (a principal, an assistant principal, or even himself or herself) as the power in the school, but then did not specify what power meant. Even when pressed to clarify what they meant by power, some respondents simply repeated the name or position of the person identified. Because such identifications could reflect a relation in any of the power categories outlined by Nyberg, we did not regard them as expressing specific conceptions of power.

We then viewed the teachers in relation to the predominant disposition of power they saw themselves as wishing to exercise. Unlike the situation in previous chapters, the teachers initially could not be categorized according to the four teacher types. In a subanalysis, however, explained later in this chapter, the dispositions in terms of teacher types showed some relation to conceptions of power. In this analysis, 69 (94.5%) of our respondents stated that power in schools was the relation identified as *exchange*—that is, the type of power based on exchanges among participants, a need to be concerned about the interests of others in the relation, and/or the necessary assumptions that must be met so that some power could be exercised. The other four interviewees (5.5%) could be categorized as relying on threats as the major category of power in their work. None of the teachers identified either persuasion or love as the primary approach to exercising power in the schools. To understand the disposition to exchange or threats, it is best to hear the teachers' own descriptions.

EXCHANGE AS POWER IN TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS

As a category of power, Nyberg (1981) defined exchange as described earlier under "Finance." Remarkably, 69 out of the 73 teachers we interviewed could be categorized as having this disposition toward exercising power. In our discussions of freedom and authority, the teachers were distributed more evenly among the categories used for analysis than in the case of power. The strong focus on exchange, however, may be explained by Nyberg's (1981) observation on the relation among authority, freedom, and power:

> American ambivalence about power is in large part the consequence of contradictory teachings that leave one both wanting and fearing power. On the one hand, the theme of achievement, which holds a prominent place in American culture, is taught to the very young as a positive expression of power, as the ability to become what we invent or imagine for ourselves. We are taught to strive for and take pride in achievement, and to respect the achievement of others. The magnitude of one's achievement is the measure of this positive power. On the other hand, Americans reject the European tradition of authority in all its monarchic regalia, maintaining that there is no higher human authority than the free and independent individual, and that rule without popular consent cannot be legitimate. Until recently, some families still manifested the regimen of monarchy, but for the most part this last vestige of the old authority is replaced by the ideal of consent. In replacing that tradition, consent stands as the central principle of the American idea of freedom. (pp. 30–31)

In exchange power, the values of achievement and of consent are connected. At the very least, according to Nyberg (1981), the exchange form of power in education "can be seen in the assignment of grades, promotions, honors, recommendations, and the like in exchange for hard work, high achievement and good behavior" (p. 76). In this form of power, the reward for consent by the student is recognition of the student's achievement by the teacher. To be sure, the definitions of achievement and consent reside with the teacher; if the student has other definitions or interests with respect to achievement or consent, the exchange of costs and benefits at least is hindered.

In their interviews, teachers identified problems of cooperation within the exchange of costs and benefits as related to unprepared students, whether their unpreparedness was due to lack of motivation or cooperation, or simply possessing different skills than those necessary for the expected tasks. Other problems of cooperation re-

side with unsupportive parents. Cohn (Cohn & Kottkamp, 1993; Cohn et al., 1987) focused on teachers' interpersonal relations with unwilling students and uncooperative parents as "problems of the profession" of teaching. Our analysis concentrates on teachers' struggles to negotiate with these constituencies. Teachers also see that their own achievement and consent, and thus their power, is undermined by demands for accountability and evaluation. How this situation is expressed as an exchange form of power can be seen most clearly by reviewing the teachers' observations.

Exchange Relations With Students

Difficulty in working with students was a primary concern for our interviewees in their struggle to negotiate the power to teach. They identified difficulties in dealing with students who were unmotivated, uncooperative, or simply different, unlike those they were prepared to teach. On the surface, these problems were simple for some teachers. Teresa believed that unmotivated students resulted from a curriculum with too much "routine" and too many "worksheets" (70, F, H, Elem/L, Spec.Span.). Lucy thought these students experienced "boring situations" that had to be made "fun" and "interesting" by the teacher (40, F, W, Elem/H, 2nd). Uncooperative students, according to Anna, were the result of "universalized education"—that is, the same education for all, or education that does not recognize different interests (03, F, H, Jr/L, Gen.Sci.). In addition to differences in interests, Sally viewed the problems of different students with different needs as compounded by an ever-increasing class size, which made the situation "impossible. You can't get to all of them. It makes things very difficult" (62, F, W, Jr/H, Math./Arith.). In light of the frequency of these comments, however, such simple, obvious answers do not tell the whole story of teachers' struggles to negotiate for the power to teach with unmotivated, uncooperative, or simply "different" students.

Unmotivated students. The teachers that we interviewed were concerned about trying to teach unmotivated students. They regarded this as a recent situation. As Catherine explained, "I think that the attitude of the child to the school has changed because I don't see children sitting there waiting to get taught anymore" (13, F, W, Jr/L, 6th). This change is not to be understood as applicable to all students, but our respondents viewed it as a growing phenomenon. In Roberta's words, "I think it's going downhill. Each year I get fewer

and fewer. . . . I don't seem to have as many kids who are motivated, who really want to learn, as I had the first year" (59, F, B, Jr/H, Spec.Ed./L.D.).

Different teachers saw the phenomenon in different ways, and each tended to identify it from personal experience. Bridget reported that in working with her students, she had to "let them understand that this is not all just a game. [They're] here for a reason" (12, F, B, Elem/H, 2nd). Hope recalled, "Years ago the students did work for the sake of learning. Children now do the work for grades" (28, F, B, Sr/M, Math./Geom.). Hope also spoke about the low expectations of those students who worked only for grades. She remarked, "I really don't know what it is now, but I'll find so many children who will tell me, 'I just want to make a D.' "

Students' past experience contributes to their motivation. The teachers described themselves as working against the students' past. Nicholas encountered this problem when he helped his students prepare for exams: "I have seen them defeated. Today's talk was not harassment and cram, but think positively about yourself" (51, M, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.). Sometimes this cheering function yielded significant benefits. For Barbara the experience was captured in the turnaround of a student who previously had laughed at learning. At the time of the interview, if she could have given an award for most improved:

> it would be him because his whole attitude about learning has changed. Now he wants to learn. He even will stand up in class and, to the kids acting up, say, "Sit down and shut up, man. I want to learn. If you don't, I do." (08, F, B, Jr/H, Spec.Ed./V.E.)

This type of turnaround resulted from a great deal of work. In this regard, the teachers said that the work necessary to address this lack of motivation was taking up an increasing part of the time allotted to teaching.

The most significant contribution to motivating students, as identified by the teachers, was their own enthusiasm. When Victoria was asked about her strengths as a teacher, she responded, "My strengths, I feel, are those in which I can motivate a student—motivate them into learning" (71, F, B, Sr/M, Spec.Ed./L.D.). To capture students' enthusiasm, the teacher had to work at it. Thus Albert described a good day as one on which he found

> the enthusiasm that the kids have when they get into it. Now some days you're going to have a day when they're just not into it. That's be-

> cause the motivation wasn't there that day or I eased off or whatever. But you get those days when the kids are just really ready to go. (02, M, H, Sr/H, Phys.Ed.)

The teachers showed their enthusiasm in various ways. Some expressed it in the way they presented subject matter. One of these teachers, Nelly, described her own focus on enthusiasm:

> I've got literature for sale. I present it and I'm selling it to the kids. Then, when I'm successful, I think it's the greatest. I feel very rewarded when the kids say to me, "You're the only teacher that really got out, gets out, and gets into it." (50, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

In contrast, George emphasized injecting his own attitude when he said:

> I think attitude is more important than knowledge and skill. I think you have to be a mold breaker more than an educator. If you can motivate kids to want to do it, they will do it. I think that's what makes successful teachers and what makes teachers who are not successful. It's an attitude in the classroom and if you can get these kids motivated by your own attitude, by the way you go in there and act, I think you'll be a lot more successful than if you just go in there and throw facts at them. (22, M, H, Sr/M, Phys.Ed./Dri.Ed.)

Somewhere between these two teachers were those who concentrated on conveying their expectations about learning. Brenda, one such teacher, said, "I think I motivate the children to really want to do well. I have very high expectations for the children" (11, F, W, Elem/H, Primary).

Although teachers regarded their role in motivation as important, they also noted that connecting to the students' interests is a crucial part of the task. To Cecilia, an essential part of being a good teacher is that "you have to be able to get across to the kids and find out what motivates them basically" (14, F, B, Elem/M, 3rd). Stanley has a good day when "I have something that I know the kids are really going to enjoy, that they're going to have fun with, that they're going to respond to, that they're going to be excited about" (65, M, W, Jr/H, Sci.Bio.).

In terms of exchange power, the unmotivated student described by these teachers is one who does not place enough value on grades, promotions, honors, recommendations, and the like to participate in the exchange process of rendering hard work, high achievement, and good behavior. Teachers must work with these students to induce them to participate in the exchange. As we have seen, some teach-

ers reported success in this area; others did not. Even when these teachers achieved success, it seemed to be measured in inches rather than miles.

Uncooperative students. In terms of the exchange dimension of power, teachers can be viewed as negotiating with unmotivated students to get them to learn. This is only part of the story, however: These teachers also struggled against factors that draw students away from learning and make them seem uncooperative. Teachers found themselves negotiating a learning environment with students whose lives are more complex than in the past. Leo, for example, saw a need to negotiate with an increasingly complex outside world in order to deal with the distractions of that world:

> I think the more there is to know in this world, it seems the less we're able to teach them each year because they've got a lot of other things to distract them. We've got to find a way to bring that measure of distraction into the school curriculum or we're going to lose them. (37, M, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts)

For high school students, the attraction of outside jobs interferes with the teaching process. Hope expressed her powerlessness to help students who worked 8 to 10 hours a day: "I have so many who tell me that they can't come back to do makeup work because they've got a job" (28, F, B, Sr/M, Math./Geom.). For some students, distractions take the form of extracurricular activities, for example, when seniors prepared to attend Grad Nite at Walt Disney World. Linda related how she struggled with these types of distractions:

> Sometimes you're up against a brick wall. You have a love of your subject matter. Sometimes it's difficult to communicate that to a student. Students have other things going on in their minds. Especially towards the end of the year the kids are concerned with Grad Nite and things like that, and you're trying to get objectives across. They're just not responding. So you realize this is their problem, and you just try to forge ahead. If they're not receptive to the idea, you try to reach the students that are. (38, F, W, Sr/L, Fine Arts/Art)

In short, schooling is not the center of most students' lives. Alice pointed out that in the past, "the school was the center of our whole life. It's not like that anymore. School's not that important anymore" (01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.). To Garry, the present also represents a loss of support for teaching. In the past, as he put it, "you had the community pressure, you had the peer pressure, to do the right

thing. Today I don't feel that you have the peer pressure or community pressure to do the right thing" (23, M, W, Jr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.). As a result, he viewed today's students as needing the teacher's help to move beyond those pressures.

In some ways Garry and Hope were well situated in their struggle to make education an important force in students' lives. They were struggling to make enough room to allow the power of education to work. Other teachers expressed their frustration at lacking power over a minority of disruptive students. According to Matthew, "We have a lot of students who are learning. We have some who are disrupting and we have some that don't want to learn. But the majority do want to learn, do want to accomplish something" (45, M, B, Jr/L, Soc.Stud./Civ./Gov.). This minority can undermine a teacher's power to be effective, even when it consists of one student. Margaret told us:

> Now in the midst of my class I have got this kid either socializing or sleeping and there has to be an alternative to that. There has to be an alternative program within the school setting or an alternative school or alternative something to get those kids out of the classroom. (41, F, W, Jr/M, Basic Math)

When Deborah was asked what she liked least about teaching, she responded:

> I would say that it's the undisciplined child that you have to contend with. It takes away so much from your day. It denies the other children their right for a good education to have that one child in your room, that's disrupting the class frequently. (17, F, W, Elem/L, 4th)

Regular attention to matters such as these led Mary to ask "Am I there to police the children or am I there to teach the children?" (47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.). Particular students were receiving all the attention, and that attention was related to discipline, not to teaching. In such cases, the teachers' power to set the agenda moves into the background, and teachers must assume policing and monitoring roles to maintain order.

Because some of the teachers we interviewed taught in urban areas, where violence and crime surround the school neighborhood, it was not surprising to hear accounts like Sonia's. She described an altercation between students, in which one student grabbed another's desk: "Ricky had no intention of letting the [other] kid's desk and chair go. The kid was scared to death" (68, F, W, Sr/M,

Lang.Arts/Eng.). Yet because of Sonia's good relationship with Ricky, he stopped when she told him to do so.

The teachers often knew about violence at a personal, even a physical, level. Michael recalled, "A student knocked a teacher's eye out. What happened to the student? Nothing. He was out of school for a week or so. That's all" (46, M, B, Elem/M, Phys.Ed.).

To be sure, crime and violence were rare events. Yet their presence in schools, along with the other disruptions, spoke of a climate in which teachers had to negotiate their own power more systematically and more regularly than had the veteran teachers in the past. Even though the teachers were disposed predominantly toward an exchange or negotiation form of power, they seemed to view the disruptions as stretching the negotiation process too far.

Unlike the unmotivated students, the uncooperative students were described as having a different sense of what should go on. Accordingly they often worked in ways that were at odds with their teachers. The disruptions that the teachers described represented forces of power that seemed to call into question the powers delegated to teachers. Such questioning demonstrates further the difficulties connected with teachers' authority. According to Nyberg (1981):

> The teacher has certain delegated powers that are not often at issue in the classroom, but whether this power can be turned into authority is another question. Power that is respected by those subject to it becomes authority precisely by virtue of that judgment. (p. 79)

Even though the experiences described by teachers concerned individual students, our interviewees perceived a growing struggle because they believed that the numbers of uncooperative students in the schools were increasing. When they became a significant portion of the population, the teachers' delegated powers would be rejected by a group rather than by a series of individuals. Such a power struggle could nullify any power the school could exercise. This would verify Nyberg's (1981) observation that "[T]he organized withdrawal of consent is the power over power in schools just as it is in other organizations" (p. 79).

"Different" students. The teachers interviewed in this study reported the effects of societal changes on their work. The most significant changes for these teachers were personified by students: Children with difficulties that had to be addressed brought their problems to the schools, which were expected to take care of them. Ruth, for example, remarked, "The responsibility is on the school

now. Really, we have taken over sex education and drug abuse and every societal problem. Now how can they really handle everything?" (61, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten). Some of the teachers we interviewed said that students acted differently in regards to traditional expectations of school-related behavior.

The teachers struggled to exert their power to teach in the face of these differences. Paula felt that her training left her ill-prepared "to handle different kinds of kids. That I've learned through hard knocks. It would have been nice to have that kind of experience ahead of time" (56, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten).

Some of the teachers viewed the lack of preparation for dealing with "different" students as a systemwide problem. Sharon stated that the system was poorly prepared for this situation: "The school system is set up for the auditory student. 'Listen to your lecture. Take good notes.' How about if you're a right-brain child? It just does not teach for you. It really does not" (64, F, W, Elem/H, SpecEd./L.D.). Stanley expressed a similar concern:

> I think schools are going to be asked for more and more. I think unless the schools realize what society is about today and students are about today and what's really out there, it's just not going to work. I think eventually you're going to have to divide society up into different kinds of learners. This school as we know it now is only going to satisfy a certain segment of that society. There's just got to be different kinds of education. (65, M, W, Jr/H, Sci.Bio.)

Sonia put another spin on the subject when she described the unit she taught to high school students with poor reading and writing skills:

> I did a unit on mythology and everybody said, "What are you, crazy? Trying to teach mythology to these kids? They can't even write their own names. Well, they may not have been able to write, but they got very interested in mythology. They're very imaginative kids. They're very creative. Even though they're not great with reading and writing, their imaginations are very active. Also, a number of them have had to get by with their street sense. They may not be smart academically, but they're streetwise. I think the mythology unit worked out perfectly because it was an outlet for them. (68, F, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

In this experience, Sonia was in touch with the two areas identified by our respondents as among their most important concerns about "different" students. In her experience with "street sense," Sonia was engaging a different culture. In the creative students with read-

ing and writing difficulties, she experienced the reality of individual differences.

Through hard work and the creative use of a variety of methods, some teachers were able to deal with strains due to the conflicts of different cultures. Phyllis said proudly, "Through discipline, techniques, and behavior modification, I've crossed over that cultural barrier" (57, F, W, Elem/M, Kindergarten). Whether or not her perception of her accomplishment was accurate, at least she made the attempt. Nicholas, who recounted his own struggle to cross the cultural barrier, reported, "We have teachers who cannot let that culture come to them. They have to teach the way they taught when it was an all-white school, and they have problems" (51, M, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.).

Because of the increasing numbers of minority school-age children, the need to address cultural differences will increase. The teachers we interviewed did not give the system high marks in this regard. In addition, they faced difficulties because of what they perceived as their inadequate preparation; as a result, their exercise of the power to teach became more difficult to negotiate.

Beside possessing cultural differences, "different" students also appear in classrooms as persons with *individual* differences. Teachers reported the need to make adjustments for individual students. One student needed special services from the teacher. Oscar expressed his difficulty in reaching the student's level: "Either you have to raise yourself or lower yourself to that level before you can be effective" (52, M, H, Jr/H, Gen.Math.). For Mary this struggle was a problem: "I get down on their level but I have a little difficulty. I don't know whether it's I don't want to get down on their level or it's that I don't want them to always stay at that level" (47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.).

Among the individual problems that teachers faced, the two mentioned most often were mainstreaming and individual students with family problems. The teachers we interviewed seemed troubled because they were poorly prepared to deal with these situations. Their teacher training had not equipped them to meet the genuine needs of individuals with certain types of problems while also attending to the needs of a whole class. In both areas they struggled to negotiate the conflicts between needs and realities; none of them expressed much satisfaction with the settlements they had achieved. Particularly in the case of mainstreaming, they seemed to feel that the system had abandoned them and their students with special needs.

In the case of these "different" students, our interviewees seemed to have the desire to make social conditions in classrooms more consistent. In describing an exchange type of power, Nyberg (1981) stated:

> In the simplest of words, this form of power involves offering and withholding rewards to people in order to make social conditions more consistent with a particular plan. In power relations of this sort, consent is bought. (pp. 75–76)

The students described by these teachers, however, apparently were too far from typical to participate effectively in the exchanges related to achievement and consent. The teachers implied that they lacked the power to consent or achieve on the basis of the terms set by the teachers and/or the schools.

Exchange Relations With Parents

In their struggles to negotiate the power to teach, the teachers interviewed in this study regarded parents as important negotiating partners. Although few teachers acknowledge parents' support, the great majority identified parents as adversaries in the day-to-day negotiation of their exchange relation of power. The teachers had both negative and positive relations with parents. They were most concerned about problems with the quality of parenting and with parents they perceived as "oppositional."

Oppositional parents. Teachers perceived the negative relation with parents as dealing with a pressure group. Some, like Alice, experienced the pressure directly: "I believe truly that parents are coming down on teachers" (01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.). The pressure was also felt indirectly through the school system. According to June, "The parent puts pressure on the principal; the principal puts pressure on the teacher. Rather than fight it, the teacher says okay" (34, F, W, Sr/H, Media Spec.). Sometimes this exertion of pressure caused parents to overtly express disrespect for teachers. William related such experiences when contacting parents about their children's progress: "I've had parents hang up on me" (73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./Health). This account represented a more general feeling that parents were regularly, in Harry's words, "supportive of their children whether they are right or wrong" (29, M, B, Sr/M, Soc.Stud./Civ./Gov.). As Michael said, when there was a difference of opinion between teacher and student, "The parents believe the child" (46, M, B, Elem/M, Phys.Ed.).

In our interviewees' experience, oppositional parents were as difficult to deal with as uncooperative students. With such parents, teachers' normally delegated powers were called into question. As a result,

power could not be converted into authority. Because of the parents' power to work as political action group, as well as exerting external influence on the school as a whole, the withdrawal of parental support presented the teachers with a true power struggle. In Nyberg's (1981) words, "The organized withdrawal of consent is the power over power in schools just as it is in other organizations" (p. 79).

Supportive parents. Teachers want support from parents. Most seemed to work under the assumption expressed by Harriet: "You have the best chance with a child when the child knows that you, the teacher, and his parents or mother are working together" (26, F, W, Elem/L, 4th). Teachers most often told us that parents were supportive in the inner city, contrary to the cultural stereotype of parenting as absent. Nicholas reported that in his work in an inner-city high school, "I have never been this supported as I am by black parents" (51, M, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.). Charles spoke of hard-working peoples' mutual respect:

> Inner-city parents work hard at very hard jobs, and they can't afford to take time off to come to school to talk to you because their kid has done something stupid. They are not going to do it. They are going to expect you to take care of the problem. If you call them on the phone and explain to them what the problem is, they are going to handle it very quickly at home because they just can't afford to spend time coming in for a day and losing a day's wages because their kid did something dumb. If it were something serious, where a young girl has gotten herself pregnant and she's been afraid to talk to the parent, they want you to be there when they're going to tell the parent. That's something different. Even in that, I have found parents to be real receptive and supportive. (15, M, W, Sr/L, Gen.Sci.)

In contrast to the oppositional parents of uncooperative students, many inner-city parents consented willingly to the teachers' work. As a result, their organized affirmation of consent worked opposite to Nyberg's observation about power over power; it seemed to become power supporting power in the schools. Also noteworthy in these supportive exchanges was a perceived common understanding of good parenting. When teachers were in conflict with parents, some of the conflicts were related to the teachers' feeling that parents lacked appropriate approaches to parenting.

Problems with parenting. In attempts to establish the power necessary to teach, teachers encountered parents who abdicated their responsibility to the teacher. Garry told us, "In many situations today

I have called parents, and some parents have told me they're not interested. [They say] 'You handle it whatever way you can' " (23, M, W, Jr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.). This lack of interest was corroborated by Gertrude:

> There's not very much cooperation from parents. I have had occasion to call parents and say, "I'm having a problem with your child about X Y Z." The parent says, "Well, that's your problem. You take care of it. Don't bother me," and hangs up. (24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary)

Such lack of interest caused teachers such as Harriet to occasionally see themselves as "baby sitters" (26, F, W, Elem/L, 4th). Wendy commented that in addition to teaching children, "Many parents would like to see us raise them" (72, F, W, Elem/H, Librarian).

Faced with these difficulties, some teachers felt they could legitimately evaluate parents from their experience of negotiating with them. Parents did not receive high marks. For Stanley the problem was simple: "Parents have failed as far as the children they are sending us" (65, M, W, Jr/H, Sci.Bio.). Teachers are vulnerable in today's society, according to Nelly, because parents are "so unsuccessful" (50, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.). This perception of parents' failure or lack of success led Donald to ask, "Where is parent accountability?" (18, M, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.).

The teachers believed that television abetted the lack of parenting. In Donald's experience, "Parents don't guide their own children in many cases, the TV does that" (18, M, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.). Nelly reported children's television viewing as "doing nothing, nothing constructive" (50, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.).

A few teachers cited cases in which parents acted as negative role models for good citizenship. In describing his attempts to create the right atmosphere, Michael recalled that parents had told his students to tell him, "You touch me, I will sue you" (46, M, B, Elem/M, Phys.Ed.).

This defiance was not the greatest problem. Alice was upset by experiences that led her to conclude, "The parents are going to teach their kids to defy the law" (01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.). Her fear was confirmed by Albert, who related parents' involvement in a confrontation with a student who possessed marijuana:

> The parent came in and the parent gave the kid hell because the kid was taking her stash and selling it. That's what the parent cared about. I left. I started laughing. I said, "I'm crazy." I had to leave the office because I broke out, I broke up laughing. But that was the gist of it. I

> mean, she was mad, not that the kid was smoking, had it in school, or anything else, but that it was hers. (02, M, H, Sr/H, Phys.Ed.)

Problems with parents have intruded frighteningly into the fragile world of teaching in incidents of child and sexual abuse. It is not only that parents and others outside the school abuse children. In addition, because of the fear of being falsely accused of molesting a child, many teachers are changing the terms on which they interact with students. As Francine noted:

> I don't put a finger on a child except for a little hug. I mean, I wouldn't leave myself in the position. I can see how some teachers are in a situation now. I'm not in a self-contained classroom. I have walls, but people walk through all the time. I'm visible. (20, F, W, Elem/H, 2nd)

For Gertrude, a false accusation of child abuse was not a fear but a reality. One of her students had been abused, and Gertrude had reported it, but it could not be proved. Later the child was abused again, and said that Gertrude did it. Fortunately her principal "knew about the physical abuse because it took all day for the child to admit, yes, her mother had hit her. But she was afraid to tell her aunt. . . . I was, let me tell you, quaking in my boots" (24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary)

From lack of support to false charges of child abuse, teachers find themselves in a changed teaching world. In this world they must fight, without much support from parents, to establish the credibility of their power to teach the children who are sent to school. Our interviewees did not seem to recognize a consistent model of parenting for their students. Thus they found it more difficult to identify common experiences in order to work with students as groups or classes. As Nyberg (1981) observed about exchange power, "The teacher's point is to get students as individuals, and as whole classes, to develop a commitment to a particular educational activity" (p. 80). With the lessening of commonalities on which to build whole classes, the delegated powers of teachers again are in question, and the forces of power over teachers' power are more evident in the teachers' daily world.

Exchange Relations Resulting From Demands for Accountability

Because of legislated mandates (McCloskey et al., 1987) and other changes (Cohn et al., 1987; see also Cohn & Kottkamp, 1993) in the

past two decades, teachers now face an increasing demand for accountability. This demand has created a climate of pressure in which teachers feel a decreasing sense of power. Helen believed that this pressure was epitomized in an overemphasis on testing:

> Testing seems to be at a level of importance which I think is necessary, but it should not be the overall factor of achieving or measuring the child's achievement. That is a lot of pressure for accountability. (27, F, W, Elem/M, 2nd)

Sylvia thought the pressure was more general. Pressure, she said, is expected from the outside—from the bureaucracy or from whatever comes to the principal—and

> what happens is it filters down. The principal comes under accountability and the assistant principal is under it. They put pressure on the teachers, so that instead of uplifting us all into accountability it's a pressure that's pushing down into accountability. (69, F, W, Jr/M, Spec.Ed./V.E.)

Other teachers identified the pressure of accountability in other ways. Gloria stated that teachers "are constantly being accountable. I hate the word 'accountability.' It is [only] a word, really, but I hear it and I shake a bit" (25, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.). Leo viewed the pressure as part of a larger tendency of federal mandates when he observed that federal mandates had been used "since Nixon did it with the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit, and to my mind unconstitutionally, as blackmail" (37, M, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts).

Aside from these particular reactions, the teachers' more general feeling was one of vulnerability. Albert remarked, "It's become built into the system now. It's built into things that come down to you as a teacher in memorandums and so forth. You've got to protect yourself" (02, M, H, Sr/H, Phys.Ed.). Societal problems not necessarily related to education, such as increased recognition of child and sexual abuse, also have influenced notions of accountability among teachers. Paula observed, "We're also vulnerable to what's happening in Dade County recently with child abuse" (56, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten). For some teachers the feeling of vulnerability is part of the package of teaching. Monica felt that teachers should be concerned about

> accountability for what children learn. I think we are very vulnerable to that, and I think we should be. When you hear teachers say that we are not responsible, I think they're wrong. I think we are. If we have

> children for 7 1/2 hours a day, we are responsible for the learning. (48, F, H, Elem/M, 6th)

Whether the feeling is positive or negative, accountability causes more than feelings. Teachers reported that it affected their teaching. The paperwork resulting from accountability mandates bothered Gertrude so much that she reported, "I actually clocked my teaching time for three days. I think the most I taught on one of those three days was 54 minutes that I was actually working with kids and teaching them something" (24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary). Clocking one's teaching time resembles a business practice whereby time is related to efficiency. Paula regarded the impact of business as pervasive in the accountability movement: "You have to look at education now as a business, because that's what they've made it into by the pressures" (56, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten).

Earlier in this chapter we spoke of students and parents as important factors' in teachers' concerns about power. Because positive relationships are fewer, teachers view themselves as increasingly powerless, possibly because they see themselves as somewhat more accountable to students and parents. William described his hierarchy of accountability:

> Number one is to myself. If I am not comfortable with myself teaching one particular thing, or any method of teaching or discipline, any particular area, I can't do it. I feel accountable to the kids second, because that's primarily why I'm there—to help them. Third, I'd rate the parents because I think they expect us to do our jobs. Then I'd say coworkers, and I'd throw the administration all the way down the line.(73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./Health)

As used by teachers, however, "accountability" seemed to mean legislative and societal demands that did not issue from a particular person. No individual was identified as responsible for the increased demand for accountability.

The teachers considered principals to be in the middle of the accountability struggle.[2] They viewed accountability mandates as Educational public relations, an attempt to appear to be responding to societal demands. According to Stanley:

---

[2] In addition to the struggle with students and parents, teachers spoke of difficulties with their principals and peers. These difficulties were not as serious a concern to teachers as were those with students and parents. An analysis of interpersonal relations with peers and principals is presented in Cohn et al. (1988), as well as in Cohn and Kottkamp (1993).

> The improvement of different things has taken so much time and energy away from the classroom and away from teaching that I look at it as strictly a political thing—that the state administration, the department of education strictly has to do things to show the public that teachers are doing more to teach their children. This is all a political, P.R., type of thing. (65, M, W, Jr/H, Sci.Bio.)

If accountability in fact has a public relations aspect, and if it is not the product of any particular individual or group of individuals, teachers must refer to accountability as the work of an indeterminate "they." This "they" functions like the uncooperative student and the oppositional parent, and leads to the struggle for what Nyberg (1981) called "power over power." Teachers may feel this intimidation and vulnerability, however, because the source is unidentified. Their struggles with students and parents involved real, specific people. They could work with them, and even if they do not succeed, they knew where the problem was. In the case of impersonal mandates, there was no one with whom to attempt negotiations and no exchange relation of power. Because this relation involves negotiating for success, the absence of a person or a force as negotiating partner left teachers alone, with the feeling that they were "forced" to concede.

Given that the great majority of teachers reject an approach to power based on threats or force, why would they feel comfortable with such an approach was imposed on them? This approach would be even more troubling if they could not negotiate any other resolution. In the face of demands for accountability, it seems, teachers are treated in a power relationship as they would not willingly treat others. In addition, they regard themselves as victims of power over their power.

Exchange Relations Pertaining to Evaluation

While we were conducting the research for this study, one of the accountability mandates at work in Dade County was a series of attempts at implementing a merit pay program.[3] As a result of these attempts, teachers felt a greater loss of power. Diane remarked, "This merit pay raise is demoralizing" (19, F, W, Elem/H, 3rd). Her comment could easily be ignored because she failed to receive merit pay.

[3] In earlier analyses, extensive work was done on teachers' conceptions of merit pay. Those studies were Cohn, Kottkamp, and Provenzo (1986a), Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn (1986a), and Provenzo, McCloskey, Cohn, Kottkamp, and Proller (1987). Additional analysis can be found in Cohn and Kottkamp (1993).

Stanley, however, when asked to describe the reaction of the teachers in his school, responded, "I'd say tremendous demoralization" (65, M, W, Jr/H, Sci.Bio.). Unlike Diane, he received a merit raise.

This demoralization was not simply a feeling of lost prestige or self-esteem. Teachers reported a climate of unhealthy competition in connection with the program. For Karen, the underlying ethic of merit pay contradicted what schools and teaching are about. She stated, "Most of the people who go into the teaching field are not competitive, and once you pit teacher against teacher you have a big problem" (35, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.). Phyllis believed that merit pay contributed to problems with parents, who would want only a "meritorious" teacher for their child. She envisioned them as saying, "I want my son or daughter taught by a meritorious teacher" (57, F, W, Elem/M, Kindergarten). As a result, teacher would be set against teacher, and teachers against parents.

Some teachers, like Wendy, "just didn't want the hassle" (72, F, W, Elem./H, Librarian). The need for respectable wages, however, contributed to the demoralization. Barbara asked, "Why do they need merit pay? Why can't all teachers get a decent salary?" (08, F, B, Jr/H, Spec.Ed./V.E.). Catherine demanded, "Let's pay teachers and pay them adequately, and forget about merit pay" (13, F, W, Jr/L, 6th). Francine said, "The real issue is that you need a decent standard of living for people to enter the profession and stay in the profession. I think it's a real crisis. I think merit pay is nonsense" (20, F, W, Elem/H, 2nd).

The teachers interviewed perceived the merit pay programs as challenging their delegated power in the system. The demoralization and the low pay were only symptoms of a deeper reality concerning power. In Harry's words, society should "pay teachers according to what they're worth" (29, M, B, Sr/M, Soc.Stud./Civ./Gov.). The experience of merit pay programs sent the message to most of these teachers that society did not value them as much as the teachers thought it should. This experience could be viewed as an anomaly due to a peculiar situation or poor implementation in Dade County.

The same teachers, however, questioned the possibility of implementing any effective merit pay program. Hope expressed an emotional reaction: "I don't feel that it's going to be fair" (28, F, B, Sr/M, Math./Geom.). Others, too, were concerned about fairness. Nancy stated, "It's going to come down to subjective evaluation" (49, F, W, Jr/M, Soc.Stud.).

How could fairness exist without objectivity? Subjectivity, however, is not due to bad people or bad judgments. According to Stanley, "Every teacher has something different in them and teaches in a dif-

ferent way and comes from a different place and ends up in a different place with students. I just don't see that there is any way of doing it" (65, M, W, Jr/H, Sci.Bio.). Catherine also referred to this inability to devise an objective way to accomplish the idea: "I don't think there is a way you can structure it" (13, F, W, Jr/L, 6th).

For a few of the teachers, experience proved them correct in their concerns about objectivity. Alice recalled:

> The principal said that I had the top rating of any teacher in the school. When it came out, the lowest teacher in our school, the one they want out, that they are writing prescriptions on, got twenty-five points higher than I did. (01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.)

In this case an allegedly incompetent teacher, identified for prescriptive correction, emerged on top because of evaluation measures that were perceived as inaccurate. William, after seeing the implementation, was waiting for "the nonbiased evaluator" (73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./Health). Whether in conception or in experience, our interviewees' main problem with merit pay was the issue of objectivity.

Merit pay and concerns related to its objectivity connect to concerns about power in the sense that teachers who seek a power relation of negotiation based on exchange are imposed on once again as a result of merit pay. This imposition makes it increasingly difficult to seek the connections needed for negotiating suitable circumstances for work. The subjectivity of the merit pay program was yet another imposition from the outside whereby teachers were excluded from the discussion of program development. In the exchange framework of power, the subjective nature of merit could become intersubjective in the presence of a joint effort to negotiate a working understanding. Again, according to Nyberg (1981), the exchange form of power "can be seen in the assignment of grades, promotions, honors, recommendations and the like in exchange for hard work, high achievement and good behavior" (p. 76).

According to the teachers, their hard work, high achievement, and good behavior, as indicators of their consent, were not rewarded in merit pay and favorable evaluations. Rather, they experienced an arbitrary, unilateral imposition of standards. As a result, they once again found themselves outside the power loop. In the face of the difficulties in the daily power negotiations between students and teachers, merit pay as a real rather than a theoretical concern reinforced these teachers' recognition that their power to act autonomously "possesse[d] no legitimation" (Lortie, 1969, p. 363). In other words, other sources of power functioned over their power. Without formal

legitimation, these teachers had no avenue by which to negotiate what they believed were their rights. In the end, the merit pay programs they experienced diminished their sense of their own worth in the system.

THREATS AS POWER IN TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS

A second conception of power mentioned by the teachers involves threats. As noted earlier, Nyberg (1981) described threats by saying that "the most primitive and least stable form of power is that occurring when actual or threatened physical harm is used to force consent (obedience) from the otherwise unwilling" (p. 70). Even though power as threats, according to Nyberg, is a negative, even "dirty," concept in education, four of our teachers (5.5%) operated from this perspective. Interestingly, three of these four teachers were among those we identified earlier as Type 4 teachers, those teaching by happenstance. The fourth belonged to Type 3, a teacher seeking the freedom to create microworlds.

As we observed in our discussion of freedom and authority, these types of teachers are not in the mainstream of the teaching population. The following review of their ideas about power should clarify their lack of connectedness to the major directions of teaching, and particularly their general disposition toward power as an exchange relation in teaching.

Clara seemed to capture the features mentioned by the other teachers who favored this mindset. For her, the school and the classroom were places where teachers lacked the authority to control:

> We need to have a little bit more control because the students know who has control, because it has been out that—Some students will actually tell you, "You better not touch me because if you do I'm going to tell my mother and she's going to sue you and you're going to be fired." You know we don't have—There is nothing we can do. It's like our hands are tied. (16, F, B, Elem/M, Intermediate)

On the surface, this sounds like a threat made by a difficult student in a litigious age. Clara, however, saw a positive value in physical punishment and might even have been conveying such a message to students. She reflected on the experience of sending her daughter to a private school for kindergarten: "Over where she went, the principal ran the school. If she had to paddle them, she paddled them and my daughter was learning very well" (16, F, B, Elem/M, Intermedi-

ate). Clara also saw a value in teachers' being permitted to spank children. As she observed elsewhere in the interview, "Children really haven't changed. Some of them are more mischievous because now we're not allowed to spank them for the things that they are doing wrong in the classroom" (16, F, B, Elem/M, Intermediate).

Despite Clara's "spare the rod and spoil the child" attitude, reality forced her to seek other forms of threats and punishment. In emphasizing the threat motif, she agreed with the other teachers in this category, who did not mention physical threats. They all sought acceptable ways to convey the message. Clara described some of her techniques: "When I ask you to be quiet, I have to raise my voice the second time and then you get quiet, or I have to have somebody take names, or I have to say I'm giving you an F in red" (16, F, B, Elem/M, Intermediate). In another case, "I'm a parent and I don't like people hollering at my kids, but if that's what it takes to make them settle down, then fine" (16, F, B, Elem/M, Intermediate). In describing a technique that the administration deemed unacceptable, she said, "Today the assistant principal told me that holding their hands up in the air was not a proper form of punishment" (16, F, B, Elem/M, Intermediate).

These teachers believed that no threat equals no learning. Brian explained his relation to his students as follows, "I tell them sit down or get out. . . . You have to be tough, you have to be on top of them all the time" (07, M, W, Sr/L, Gen.Sci.). On the other hand, Rita saw a need for the principal to establish a threat throughout the school. About her own principal she remarked, "With this lady they don't learn. Then you've got 'I don't care. She's not going to do anything to me' " (58, F, B, Elem/L, Kindergarten).

For these teachers, setting the tone was a constant power struggle for the purpose of demonstrating that they were in charge. Brian spoke about what he had learned at the outset of his career: "I learned right then and there that I had to be just tough as nails, that I had to get in there and show them who's boss right then and there" (07, M, W, Sr/L, Gen.Sci.). Rita again emphasized the principal's role when she described the support she had received from a previous principal: "She would come in and talk to the kids and tell them the teacher's in charge and this and that. This particular principal I have now, she's not like that. What could I say about her?" (58, F, B, Elem/L, Kindergarten).

These teachers' discussions of power as a threat relation made it clear that they were an unusual group. Few other teachers even referred to paddling or physical threats except as something that schooling was well rid of. Also, because of difficulties in maintaining

the order necessary for teaching, these teachers seemed to have unusually high incidences of interaction with their principals. Most of the interviewees spoke about their principals only when asked one of the questions about them; in contrast, these teachers cited such interaction or lack of interaction as a significant part of their teaching experience. As Maria remarked about her principal, "If she has a bad day or comes in in a bad mood, she makes everybody's day bad" (43, F, B, Elem/M, 4th). If we judge by the overall picture presented by the whole group, most of the teachers probably would not even know that a principal was having a bad day. Those who were in regular contact with the principal, however, certainly would know.

PERSUASION AND LOVE IN TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS

Our analysis has shown that teachers identified exchange as the overriding category of power, with threats a distant second. Yet some teachers also referred to situations related to the power of persuasion and love. Consequently we examined how often they referred to situations related to persuasion and love as types of power. In this analysis, exchange accounts for 73.9% (769) of all the descriptions (1,041) we identified as reflecting conceptions of power. Threats account for the second largest group of descriptions (191 or 18.4%). The other two categories, love (59 or 5.7%) and persuasion (22 or 2.1%), make up the small remainder. Yet when we examined these groups in relation to the four types of teacher, teachers of each type showed unusual numbers of responses involving particular conceptions of power. Those findings are displayed in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1
Types of Teacher, by Frequency and Percentage of Power Type

Teacher Type	# of Teachers	Exchange Frequency	Threats Frequency	Love Frequency	Persuasion Frequency	Total
1	30	414	75	33	11	533
	(41.1%)	(53.8%)	(39.3%)	(55.9%)	(50%)	(51.2%)
2	27	185	42	22	8	257
	(37%)	(24.1%)	(22%)	(37.3%)	(36.4%)	(24.7%)
3	11	141	48	4	3	196
	(15.1%)	(18.3%)	(25.1%)	(6.8%)	(13.6%)	(18.8%)
4	5	29	26	0	0	55
	(6.8%)	(3.8%)	(13.6%)	(0%)	(0%)	(5.3%)
Total	73	769	191	59	22	1,041

A high proportion of references to both persuasion and love come from teachers of Types 1 and 2. They also come predominantly from teachers with a disposition toward exchange as the basis for power relationships. These figures also show that Type 4 teachers speak of threats almost twice as often, proportionally (13.6%), as the other interviewees (6.9%). Because most Type 4 teachers are disposed toward threats in their power relations, this statistic reinforces the earlier findings about threats.

Concerns about persuasion and love identified in Table 7.1 follow the patterns of teacher types and the overall disposition toward an exchange relation to power. Because these two categories support concepts already outlined, overall impressions rather than particular statements seem a more fruitful way of presenting this part of the analysis.

For the Type 1 teacher, who seeks the freedom to be student-centered, images of persuasion and concerns about love relate to the need for connecting to students. Images of interrelations in the teaching project reinforce the desire of this group for an exchange power relation, one in which the class becomes a group that works together toward learning.

For the Type 2 teacher, who seeks the freedom of subject matter status, images of persuasion and concerns about love center on examples in which subject matter is considered important. Images of students interested in subject matter, and of a school environment that values subject matter learning, reinforce the desire of this group for a class in which teachers and students work together on learning the subject matter with mutual support.

Even though Type 3 teachers, those who seek the freedom to create microworlds, do not unanimously favor an exchange relation of power (one favors threats), those who are oriented to the exchange form of power use both persuasion and love to support their disposition to create a microworld. Images of people in safe environments, and of students and others who support the isolation of these worlds, are evident. Through these images, students are encouraged to assist in creating and maintaining the perfect microworld of the classroom in question.

Finally, we discovered in this analysis that different teacher types held different notions of threats. The Type 4 teachers, those who were teaching by happenstance, spoke predominantly of their own need to exercise physical force to maintain control in their classrooms. These teachers believed that physical power had to be exercised over students. Yet when Type 1 and 2 teachers mentioned occasions on which they had failed in their task and had resorted to threats, their major

experience concerning force or threat was that principals and/or parents exercised it against them. These teachers saw such an attitude as a failure in themselves, or felt themselves reduced by administrators and parents below a level to which they would subject their students.

NEGOTIATING THE POWER TO TEACH

This chapter has been filled with a discussion of the negotiating that teachers employ in order to have the power necessary to teach. Even the teachers who use force as power must negotiate the social space in which to work. Further, negotiating influences the use of the power of persuasion and love by the teachers whose main power category is exchange. On the basis of the survey data included as part of this study, it seems possible that all this negotiating is significantly affecting teachers' perceptions—particularly, their perceptions of the type of student they wish to teach. Table 7.2 displays the shift in teachers' preferences in this regard.

The major shift in the 20-year period between Lortie's study the NIE survey is away from preferring "creative and intellectually demanding students who call for special effort" to " 'nice kids' from average homes, who are respectful and hard-working." It is quite possible that an important factor contributing to that shift is the day-to-day struggle to negotiate the power to teach.

This possibility is all the more probable when we look at the responses to a question included in the 1984 survey. In 1984, teachers were asked to categorize the types of student they actually had as well as their preference. Table 7.3 shows the comparison between preferred students and actual students.

Table 7.2
Students Whom Teachers Preferred to Teach

	1964 %	1984 %
Students whose emotional needs are a challenge to the teacher	6.0	3.0
"Nice kids" from average homes, who are respectful and hard working	36.2	46.6
Creative and intellectually demanding students who call for special effort	40.0	27.9
Underprivileged students from difficult or deprived homes for whom school can be a major opportunity	12.2	13.5
Students of limited ability (sometimes called "slow learners"), who need unusual patience or sympathy	5.7	9.0

Note. From Kottkamp et al. (1986c).

Table 7.3
Comparison of Preferred Students With Students Actually Taught

	Preferred %	Actual %
Students whose emotional needs are a challenge to the teacher	3.0	15.8
"Nice kids" from average homes, who are respectful and hard working	46.6	25.4
Creative and intellectually demanding students who call for special effort	27.9	7.5
Underprivileged students from difficult or deprived homes, for whom school can be a major opportunity	13.5	21.8
Students of limited ability (sometimes called "slow learners"), who need unusual patience or sympathy	9.0	29.5

Note. In Kottkamp, Cohn, McCloskey, and Provenzo, (1987) there was an analysis of this discrepancy according to teacher racial/ethnic type. Kottkamp identified students as a specific type of teacher incentive as a result of that analysis. Additional analysis of this construct can be found in Cohn and Kottkamp (1993).

In this comparison, teachers perceived the type of students they would prefer to teach as very different from their actual students. In view of such a discrepancy, any attempt to negotiate the power to teach becomes more complex.

NEGOTIATING STRAINS ON THE ETHOS OF TEACHING

The material we have discussed so far makes it evident that teachers spend a significant amount of time negotiating the right circumstances in which to teach. Lortie (1975) observed that teachers "tend to concentrate their energies at points where effort makes a difference" (p. 101). On the basis of the energy that our interviews invested in negotiating a helpful educational environment, we can conclude that they still think they can make a difference. Yet the expressions of frustration in the interviews make us wonder whether, at some time, these teachers will cease to believe that their efforts matter.

Likewise, the survey data in the last section of this chapter suggest that the new ethos of schooling is hastening the day when teachers may believe they no longer make a difference. According to the data, teachers perceive the introduction of a different type of student into the school. If this perception is true, then the changes we have termed "the new ethos of schooling" already have begun to shape teachers' responses to the culture of contemporary schools. The teachers' perceptions of the types of students present in today's

schools are not only at odds with their preferences, but also different from traditional conceptions of students in public schools. If this change in fact is so strongly present in the schools, it is not surprising that the teachers are struggling to negotiate the power to teach. The ethos of teaching has changed very little, whereas the school population has been reconfigured. Therefore teachers are daily negotiating this reality in virtually every classroom. According to Burbules (1986):

> Education as power-critique should attempt to identify generalizable human interests and to promote these in democratic and relatively power-free ways; but the fact is that schools have a severely limited capacity to alter the conflicts of interests that are the substratum of power in the contemporary world. (p. 114)

Teachers are thus constantly connected to the world's conflicts of interests through their power negotiations in the classroom.

In sum, the power reality is the struggle over an apparent withdrawal of consent and the resulting experience of what Nyberg (1981) called "power over power." This struggle involves working with a new clientele in the schools, dealing with changes in households that have resulted in differing conceptions of family and parenting, and coping with students' and parents' greater demands for rights, as well as with a changing politics of education as experienced in mandates and demands for accountability. These issues are part of "the new ethos of schooling." In the next chapter we focus on the implications of this struggle of power over power, of the new ethos of schooling over the continuing ethos of the occupation of schoolteaching, and of the negotiation that teachers must perform in this struggle.

8

Teachers' Power in a Negotiated Environment

In the previous chapter we argued that teachers perceived recent significant changes related to their power to teach. Factors involving unmotivated, uncooperative, and "different" students, oppositional parents, problems with parenting, and greater demands for accountability from the school system were identified by teachers as having changed the way they work. In sum, these factors have redefined the experience of teaching for many of our respondents.

The changes described earlier are linked to what we have defined as the new ethos of schooling. The factors related to students, parents, and accountability are the result, in many ways, of the expansion of higher education, massive population shifts, women's movement into the labor force, the changing character of postindustrial society, the civil rights and women's liberation movements, and the influence of new communication media such as television. In this chapter we explore how the struggle for power, as captured in the word *negotiation*, represents a metaphorical understanding for dealing with these changes as reflected by the teachers we interviewed. Further, we attempt to understand how this "negotiating" metaphor enables teachers to deal with the difficulty of working with aspects of both the old and the new ethoses of schooling. Finally, we seek to identify the possible contribution of the image of negotiating to understanding the teacher's role (i.e., power) in the future development of schooling.

NEGOTIATION AS A TEACHERS' METAPHOR

In our earlier work on metaphor (Provenzo et al., 1989) we found that teachers used metaphor to make sense of their reality. Faced with unexpected situations in which stock answers were inadequate to describe their experience, our interviewees responded by developing and reformulating answers through the use of metaphor. Lortie (1975), however, maintained that in the face of that same uncertainty:

> [E]ased entry and unstepped careers exacerbate rather than alleviate the feelings of uncertainty provoked by teaching tasks. Uncertainty, under these conditions, can be transformed into diffuse anxiety and painful self-doubt, which reduce the psychic rewards of classroom teaching. (p. 161)

Thus, because of this reduction in psychic rewards, teachers are confronted with critical questions. The answers that they develop enable them to assume authority and responsibility in the situations they encounter. As mentioned in Chapter 2, Ricoeur called this use of metaphor "appropriation," the means of taking control of the unknown and the unexplained (Reagan & Stewart, 1978). For these teachers, metaphor provides a means of constructing and expressing their understanding of social reality when the definitions and understandings presented to them fail to provide adequate meaning.

Faced with power relations that do not work "according to the book," the teachers described, in different ways, approaches we have identified as exchange power. Inherent in these approaches is the assumption that to make things work and to continue to function effectively, teachers must be capable of "negotiating" a teaching environment. Even though they rarely used the expression *negotiate*, our respondents regularly described situations in which the failure to negotiate would have led to failure in teaching. In the sections that follow, we outline aspects of that negotiation in relation to the work of teaching.

Negotiating a Role in the Process of Teaching

In our analysis of the interviews, we did not find any group of teachers that wished to design or structure curriculum and programs. These people saw themselves as involved in working with students by implementing rather than inventing curriculum. The clearest way to understand the "negotiation" of such implementation is through

the metaphors used by the teachers for the role of teacher and for their relation to the system.

In describing the characteristics of a teacher, Nancy captured the reality with her observation that the occupation is a "potpourri of personalities" (49, F, W, Jr/M, Soc.Stud.). In this potpourri, each teacher negotiated a place or persona based on his or her personality. Our interviewees provided a litany of images. Nicholas saw a teacher as a "good actor" (51, M, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.). Nelly described her role as that of a "preacher" or someone who has "something to sell" (50, F, W, Sr/L,Lang.Arts/Eng.); Garry viewed his role as that of a "trainer" or someone who was assisting "growth" (23, M, W, Jr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.). Gloria considered the teacher to be made of a "special cloth" (25, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.). Louis felt that he was becoming more and more of a glorified "babysitter" (39, M, W, Sr/L, IndustrialArts). Emphasizing the positives and the negatives among teachers, Sheila believed that there were two types of teachers, those who were "laying bricks" and "brick-shirkers" (66, F, W, Elem/H, 4th). Capturing the negative circumstances in which they had to negotiate a place to teach, some teachers were better at defining what they were not. Sylvia was not a "time clock" worker (69, F, W, Jr/M, Spec.Ed./V.E.), and Grace was not an "accountant" (21, F, H, Jr/M, 6th). Janice was not a "bookkeeper" (32, F, W, Elem/M, 4th), and Bonnie was not an "executive" (10, F, W, Sr/M, Soc.Stud./His.).

In facing both positives and negatives and in having to negotiate different aspects with different people, Sandra regarded herself as an "anchor" as well as "the mother, the counselor, the doctor, the lawyer, the preacher, the teacher, and everything" (63, F, B, Elem/H, Spec.Ed./V.E.).

Four teachers said that their work led to a special shaping of students: George (22, M, H, Sr/M, Phys.Ed./Dri.Ed.), June (34, F, W, Sr/H, Media Spec.), Nelly (50, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.), and Oscar (52, M, H, Jr/H, Gen.Math.) cited "molding" students as a concern for teachers. June, Nelly, and Oscar saw themselves as negotiating with the system and their students to be molders of students, or at least of their minds. George, however, viewed his role as negotiating a space to be a "mold breaker": He felt he had to inspire students to believe they could succeed, when society and other teachers in the system had shaped them to believe they could neither learn nor succeed. This image, like those listed earlier, situates teachers' work so that they are not deciding the policy or the overall direction. Rather, they are negotiators, those who implement policies or designs made by others.

One aspect of this negotiating is evident in the images that teachers connect to the system in which they work. All of these images

present the system as distant or unbending in negotiating or "working out" individual students' education. The most common image of the system was the "ivory tower," mentioned by Catherine (13, F, W, Jr/L, 6th), Gloria (25, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.), Ingrid (30, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.), Nicholas (51, M, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.), and Ruth (61, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten). Beside the difficulties with unnegotiable curriculum designs and other system-determined molds (products of the ivory tower), the "mounds" or "mountains" of paperwork generated by the system were inescapable to Bridget (12, F, B, Elem/H, 2nd), George (22, M, H, Sr/M, Phys.Ed./Dri.Ed.), June (34, F, W, Sr/H, Media Spec.), and Mary (47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.). Mary was joined by Grace (21, F, H, Jr/M, 6th), Gloria (25, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.), and Victoria (71, F, B, Sr/M, Spec.Ed./L.D.) in regarding the difficulties in implementing unnegotiable curriculum and programs as essentially a "game." Whereas Nancy sensed a "bombardment" from the system (49, F, W, Jr/M, Soc.Stud.), Gloria perceived "garbage" (25, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.). The difficulty of conflict with the system produced problems in a type of work that is hectic enough at times to be described as "Grand Central Station" by Patricia (55, F, W, Sr/L, Spec.Ed./V.E.), a "zoo" by Maria (43, F, B, Elem/M, 4th), and a "roller coaster" by George (22, M, H, Sr/M, Phys.Ed./Dri.Ed.).

Even in unnegotiable difficulties with the system, teachers situated themselves between the system and the student. In doing so, they saw themselves as what Lortie (1975) called a "catalyst" (p. 175) of learning; they were working within the system to negotiate the right chemistry for learning. More difficulties apparently have arisen in the recent past, over problematic new demands that make this traditionally intermediary (negotiated) reality of teaching more difficult.

Negotiating the Content of Teaching

Teachers included in the interviews—but, interestingly, not exclusively those in Type 2 (who sought the freedom of subject matter status)—described their role as involving the communication of subject matter and ideas. Even though they seemed to feel that their subjects should be inherently interesting to the students, they spoke of the challenge for teachers in negotiating their students' involvement in the process of learning and, by inference, of schooling. In this context, knowledge is not something in which the teacher is an expert; rather, it is something that teachers convey to students, sometimes by literally "selling" it. Many of the teachers, such as the Type 1

teacher Joan, considered it their obligation to negotiate and engage their students in the subjects they taught:

> I think the students should want to come to class. You have to stimulate them to the point that they look forward to coming to your class. If they look for ways of getting out of it, then you're not being interesting enough. (33, F, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.)

These teachers speak frequently about loving a subject and negotiating an interest among students that would not exist otherwise. Nelly stated, "I've got literature for sale. I present it and I'm selling it to the kids, and when I'm successful I think it's the greatest" (50 F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.). She described at length how she loved literature and grammar: "I find it fascinating, and unfortunately most children are turned off by the time they get to high school. If I can turn them on, I feel good about it" (50 F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.). For Nelly, introducing literature to her students was virtually the same as spreading a gospel: "Half the time I think I'm a preacher. You know, I seem to find myself constantly relating the literature, even if it had been written 160 years ago, to present day, to what these kids find are their major problems" (50 F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.).

Many of the teachers interviewed found a fascination and a reward in the negotiation involving students' development and acquisition of knowledge under their tutelage. As William explained enthusiastically, "The subject matter that I teach is fascinating because it is never standing still. . . . I enjoy the interaction with the kids because you can see them develop mentally along the line, and that keeps you going" (73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./Health). In a similar vein, Monica said that she loved to see her "children grow intellectually" (48, F, H, Elem/M, 6th); Martha stated that because she loved the children she taught, she decided to "share with the children" what she knew (44, F, H, Elem./M, 3rd).

Despite the need for knowledge of subject matter, the interviewees clearly felt that simply knowing one's subject was never sufficient to make a good teacher. Patricia explained, "I don't think everybody can be a teacher. I think it takes a special person, a person who has a certain kind of rapport with kids" (55, F, W, Sr/L, Spec.Ed./V.E.). Thus the ability to establish the climate for successful negotiation was perceived by teachers as a highly complex activity. In Nelly's words:

> I think teaching is multifaceted. I think that teaching is projecting yourself as well as having the feeling of helping children learn. . . . I

> feel you have to be a pretty good salesman to be a successful teacher. I hope I don't say the wrong thing. (50 F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

Negotiating Teacher-Student Relations

Throughout our interviews, many of the teachers defined themselves, when they were at their best, as affecting students' lives. Nicholas described, for example, how

> I want my students—I don't care if they remember me or not, it's not important—but I want them to succeed. I want them to feel the importance of an education, that they will go out into the world and do the best they can with what they have—and if I can make what they have a little bit better. (51, M, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

Oscar, on the other hand, said that he tried "to get them to think for themselves. I'm trying to get them to be inquisitive, to realize that learning is not just a finite experience, but it goes on throughout their life" (52, M, H, Jr/H, Gen.Math.). Agnes commented that as a teacher she wanted to provide her students with

> a very solid foundation in the basics. In addition to that, I want them to develop an appreciation for literature, so that they will read even beyond school. So that even if it's the newspaper, magazines, even if they're old, they [would] pick up something and they would read. They'd be informed. (04, F, B, Jr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

As in their images of outstanding teachers, being popular was less important to many of these teachers than being respected, particularly in context of those things they held important. Benjamin's description of himself, for example, although flexible, suggested a presence to be reckoned with by students, parents, and administrators:

> I'm the mean ogre, but I'm the first one they say hello to in the morning. . . . They all know that I'm totally honest with them. They do something wrong, they're going to be punished for it right then. I'm not calling mommy, I'm not waiting. Mommy wants to call me, that's fine. And if the principal gives in to Mommy, that's fine. But the next time he's going to have to go through the same thing, because the rules are the same for everybody. (05, M, W, Elem/H, Phys.Ed.)

The teachers we interviewed saw their negotiation of a teaching environment as helping to lay a foundation for their students to achieve greater things than would be possible on their own. In doing

so, they encouraged students not only to succeed in the larger society, but also to do better than their teachers. Donald repeated this theme: "What I'm doing for them is building a foundation so that they can go on and do things greater than I could ever do" (18, M, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.). For Donald, whether or not his students became doctors or scientists was not crucial. His purpose was to negotiate a positive effect on their lives. Teaching them small things, as well as large, was important for him: "We know now that the cold virus can get into the body primarily through the nose or the eyes. If I can teach them to keep their hands away from their noses and eyes, . . . [they]'ll have a healthy and happy life" (18, M, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.).

Negotiating with All Students

The teachers in our interviews, but not only those in Type 1 (those seeking the freedom to be student-centered), spoke about the importance of reaching all the children they taught, not simply working or negotiating with a selected or limited few. Such an ideal is rooted deeply in U.S. education; it can be traced back to Thomas Jefferson's belief that all individuals should receive the education they need to become all they are capable of becoming.

In this context, negotiating a teaching environment that motivates all children to succeed is extremely important. Belief in such negotiation led Brenda to explain how she motivated

> children to really want to do well. I have very high expectations for the children. . . . I just tell my children, the very first day of school, that this is the best class and I'm the best teacher. . . . I just expect the best from them and they know that right off the bat. (11, F, W, Elem/H, Primary)

The philosophy that every child is a winner seemed to be Michael's motivation:

> If they can serve the ball over the net, if they can volley the ball back, if they know how to rotate, how to keep score, you say I have accomplished this. If they can play by themselves to a certain extent, then you know that you have done a pretty good job. (46, M, B, Elem/M, Phys.Ed.)

Teaching every child to be independent, to work at his or her highest possible level, is considered essential to the process of teaching, even if it is a difficult goal. Margaret, in her attempts to negotiate the inclusion of all students, said she even threatened the brighter

children in her class that they would "get an F for the day" if they gave an answer before some of her slower and less able students had a chance to respond (41, F, W, Jr/M, Basic Math). Matthew, an older Black teacher, spoke of negotiating the protection of all of his students' right to learn, while recalling his experience of integration in the military in Korea:

> I was in the First Cavalry in Korea. We didn't have black and white. We just had soldiers. In my classroom we don't have black and white. We have students and they know, out of all those things, that they are students. They are students and I am concerned about them. I'm going to protect them and do everything in my power to see that they have the best in my classroom, and they know this. Nobody is going to come in and hurry them, nobody is going to do anything to them. I'm going to protect them and try to give them the best that I have to offer. (45, M, B, Jr/L, Soc.Stud./Civ./Gov.)

Negotiating a New Reality of Pluralism

In addition to traditional concerns, our interviewees frequently cited the negotiating skills of flexibility and tolerance as key factors in being a successful teacher. Such a model has not necessarily been part of the traditional U.S. school system; this system, since the 19th century, has defined a relatively narrow, often unnegotiable, set of values and beliefs as acceptable for the culture. Thus in the U.S. schools before the 1960s, there seemed to be no need to negotiate with or support the perspective of racial or ethnic minorities, of people with special needs, or of women. With the development of a greater pluralism, and of the new ethos of schooling, the role that teachers have had to assume in their day-to-day work has changed significantly. As Agnes pointed out, today's schools require that

> you have to be able to work with people regardless of ethnic background, regardless of differences in ideology and persuasions and convictions. You ought to be able to work with people, and you ought to have all the patience of Job. (04, F, B, Jr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.)

Negotiating an effective teaching environment has become increasingly important for many teachers. There is no single right way to teach, no single right set of rules. As Benjamin noted:

> To me one of the biggest things is being able to adapt. I teach differently all day long. I have one way of teaching my kindergarten kids. I

> do not even teach the same way with my fifth graders that I teach with my sixth graders. It's totally different. I don't teach the same way here as I do in Liberty City. I've taught summer school in a lot of black schools, where it's a different kind of thing. You've got to change, you've got to be able to change to get at the kids, to get them to listen to you. (05, M, W, Elem/H, Phys.Ed.)

According to Benjamin, methods used to capture suburban students' attention cannot be used in the inner city, and vice versa:

> I've been known to walk out and all of a sudden fall down. And then they go "what's he going to do next?" (I) let them look at that, let them think I'm crazy. They all think I'm crazy. . . . That's what works for me here. If I did that in a school in the inner city, I'd lose the kids. They'd be gone. I'd never get them back. (05, M, W, Elem/H, Phys.Ed.)

In recent years, the environment that a teacher negotiates has become based increasingly on context. Not to know one's audience—the context in which one is working—is to assure failure in negotiating an effective teaching environment.

Although teachers have always had to understand the values of the communities in which they were working, traditionally they have not had to negotiate with the range or complexity of populations that they currently face. Further, the greater pluralism and complexity of the culture place greater pressure on the teacher to cover more and more subjects and issues as part of the curriculum. As Leo explained:

> [Y]ou've got to realize knowledge is increasing exponentially, and our ability to teach seems to be decreasing . . . the more there is to know in this world, it seems like the less we're able to teach them each year, because they've got a lot of other things to distract them. (37, M, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts)

For Leo, the ability to impart knowledge was decreasing because other forms of knowledge—knowledge found outside the traditional culture of the schools—were competing with him in his negotiating of a teaching environment. This sentiment was repeated somewhat differently by Linda, who said that what was most "important is to impart knowledge, because there are so many other things that can get in the way" (38, F, W, Sr/L, Fine Arts/Art).

Linda believed that school had to be her students' only concern. She could not conceive of an alternative culture beyond the school, or of working sometimes on the outside to win in the negotiations related to the knowledge she had to impart. She recalled:

> I would never skip school because if I skipped school I would never be able to make up the work. There wasn't this lackadaisical atmosphere. . . . In the school that I teach, in most cases, the kids do not have to take jobs, but they do. (38, F, W, Sr/L, Fine Arts/Art)

Repeatedly throughout the interviews, teachers described how they experienced pluralism—a pluralism of many types and descriptions—as a constant. They made clear that this pluralism was defining the negotiation of many of the relationships in their classrooms. As Nancy remarked:

> I'm working with youngsters that are almost always from divorce situations. They have culture shock. This one is from Nicaragua. This one is from South America and they're all of a sudden all put together. You have to build some kind of bridge where we can all work together very successfully. That's why I love world history, because you can pull from each one, something, and they have something to contribute. (49, F, W, Jr/M, Soc.Stud.)

The teachers interviewed had to negotiate the building of bridges not only to reach students, but, also as we have seen, to reach the parents. Often this was a difficult task, which greatly increased the complexity and the problems related to negotiating their work. Phyllis described, for example, how

> [S]ome of the Hispanic parents are hesitant to know what to do to help their children. They feel the personal failure. I don't know how to talk to them. They feel uneducated. First of all, they can't read. We send home registration cards and expect them back the next day. It's not part of their culture to do that. So I still have four after a week that haven't brought them back. The Nicaraguans and Marielitos . . . have come over from having such a traumatic experience. There is a carryover to not respecting the police, the teacher, any authority. And like I said, if I can't reach them, I can't teach them to read and write. (57, F, W, Elem/M, Kindergarten)

The teachers in our interviews indicated that the conditions they faced in the schools, and even the roles they had to negotiate, were different from those they expected when they entered teaching. Donald, for example, stated that he "was prepared for the ideal situation, which never has existed. I saw the real picture and started adapting to it" (18, M, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.). The courses provided by schools of education and the in-service training were useless to him because they did not deal with the real demands that he addressed every day in the classroom.

In short, our interviewees perceived that aspects of the new pluralism were affecting them in many different ways. New populations had different points of reference that the teachers had to understand and negotiate with before they could even begin to implement the traditional models of teaching.

NEGOTIATING BETWEEN NEW AND OLD ETHOSES OF SCHOOLING

In *Schoolteacher*, Lortie (1975) observed that people tend "to dignify and elaborate the significance of the tasks they perform to earn a living" (p. 111). He said that teachers are no different from other occupational groups in this regard. However:

> [M]uch of the teacher's role is defined by his position in the division of labor established by the school curriculum. There is little to suggest that teachers struggle against the specifications included in the curricula; they do not seem to share the sentiments of university professors who believe that they are exclusively equipped to control instruction. (p. 111)

What we have identified as negotiating a role in the process of teaching is, in fact, a description of teachers negotiating their role in the traditional division of school labor. In addition to the general division of labor, Lortie (1975) believed that teachers emphasize "special" and "personal" concerns in their work. These concerns, according to Lortie, include:

> (1) the moral aspects of teaching, (2) the "connecting" function of the teacher who instills love of a school or a particular subject, and (3) the theme of inclusiveness—of reaching *all* students in one's charge. (p. 111)

The aspects we have identified as negotiating the content of teaching, negotiating teacher–student relations, and negotiating with all students are descriptions of these traditional "special and personal" concerns. In our interviews, the teachers spoke repeatedly about the importance of negotiating these concerns. They remain important modal characteristics that reflect the stability of teachers' sentiments over time.

These were not their only concerns, however. As we have argued, teachers are also struggling with negotiating a new reality of pluralism. In doing so, they are dealing with a set of unexpected challenges in teaching. This struggle does not stem from a larger vision of schooling, but comes from teachers' everyday experiences in the

classroom. The negotiation results largely from teachers' vision of teaching. According to Lortie (1975):

> Teachers do "people work," but they do it under somewhat special conditions. Three peculiarities are evident: the low degree of voluntarism in the teacher–student relationship, the problem of extracting work from immature workers, and the grouped context of teacher endeavors. Each characteristic influences the relational issues faced by the classroom teachers. (p. 137)

The propensity to negotiate with the new pluralism and to be changed by it, even grudgingly, flows from teachers' status difficulties. Teachers in general, and the teachers interviewed for this study in particular, are more likely to defer to others than to expect deference to themselves. Lortie (1975) commented:

> Deference can reassure people of their worth and competence; moving through a series of statuses therefore provides a gradient for psychological support. Repeated indications of others' respect can quell self-doubt. Deference, in short, can help people who work with uncertainty and ambiguity. . . . The career system of teachers, unlike that in most kinds of work, does little to offset the subject discomfort caused by intangibility and relational complexity. (p. 161)

General self-doubt, mixed with the intangibility and the relational complexity of the new pluralism, leaves teachers ready to negotiate rather than redesign their circumstances. This role difficulty is made more problematic because parents and the larger society (which send new groups of students into the classroom), rather than the teachers themselves, determine the worth—that is, the status—of teaching. Thus, said Lortie (1975):

> Were his [the teacher's] position more powerful, he might move away from other people, counting primarily on his personal capacities in teaching students. But his status proscribes this withdrawal, at least as the sole strategy; he must temper his self-isolation by seeking the support of others whom he needs in order, ironically, to make autonomy work. A kind of ambivalence is inherent in his role. (p. 181)

Wanted: Influence in Negotiating Change

Even though our respondents struggled for autonomy and support while complaining about difficulties with their freedom, authority, and power, we cannot conclude that teachers want wholesale change.

Lortie's (1975) observations about the modal teacher of the 1960s still hold true for the modal teacher in this study:

> He accepts the hegemony of the school system on which he is economically and functionally dependent. He cannot ensure that the imperatives of teaching, as he defines them, will be honored, but he chafes when they are not. (p. 186)

In chafing, the teacher is more apt to identify the problem than the solution. In regard to solutions, the teachers in our research, like those studied by Lortie (1975), want to negotiate "more of the same":

> The beliefs and preferences expressed suggest individualistic teachers who want more elbow room to practice their craft. But the state of the craft does not come under review. Respondents voiced little concern about teachers' limitations in ensuring predictable results; doubts expressed in other parts of the interview did not come into play here. The underlying critique is directed toward the organization of teacher effort and the behavior of adult coparticipants. There is no discernible preoccupation with deficiencies in the technical culture of the teaching occupation. (p. 184)

Changes in the technical culture of the occupation may be necessary and good. Such changes, however, do not seem to be part of teachers' horizon, possibly because the technical culture of the occupation does not show the teacher as a person with whom to negotiate. If the role of teaching is to change as a result of the changing ethos of schooling, the change must come from negotiating with people, particularly their students. Even though teachers are upset by the new pluralism, they are adapting and negotiating because it is present in the classroom. Parents are perceived as more troublesome than other teachers or principals because of the level of their impact on the classroom. Even the teachers' sense that the system today is more intrusive results from the extent of its impact on the isolated classroom. In short, teachers' concerns about continuity and change revolve around the classroom not simply because of their basic orientation toward individualism, but also (and more important) because that individualism connects most directly with the belief "that the teacher is the essential catalyst in the learning process" (Lortie, 1975, p. 175).

In their experience and desires regarding continuity, teachers describe the negotiation of their role as the essential catalyst in the learning process in traditional power relationships. In the last chapter we used Nyberg's (1981) discussion of "power over power." In

their traditionalism, self-isolation, individualism, and seeking of autonomy, teachers negotiate within a setting that Kreisberg (1992) also described in terms of "power over." Kreisberg observed that a conception of "power over" contains "the implicit or explicit assumption of inevitable tensions between individual fulfillment and the needs and desires of other individuals and the community as a whole" (p. 51). Thus it is not surprising that teachers' descriptions of negotiating power relations are filled with expressions of tensions.

Teachers' descriptions of their desire for support, however, also contain expressions of another conception of power. Kreisberg (1992) identifies that power as "power with":

> *Power with* is manifest in *relationships of co-agency*. These relationships are characterized by people finding ways to satisfy their desires and to fulfill their interests without imposing on one another. The relationship of co-agency is one in which there is equality: situations in which individuals and groups fulfill their desires by acting together. It is jointly developing capacity. The possibility for *power with* lies in the reality of human interconnections within community. (pp. 85–86)

In a "power with" context, the vocabulary of negotiation implies:

> [S]uch words as *coaction, interconnection, sharing, mutuality, integration, collaboration, cooperation, synthesis, vulnerability*, and *interdependence*, and such phrases as *agency-in-community, giving and openness to others, self-assertion as opposed to self-imposition*, and *the capacity to act and implement as opposed to the ability to control others*. (p. 86)

Because we have seen that among teachers "a kind of ambivalence is inherent" (Lortie, 1975, p. 181) between the desire for individualism or autonomy and the desire for support from others, their role would seem to include an unnegotiated or unresolved conflict between "power over" and "power with." We believe that this struggle represents a fundamental tension that teachers confront as they work with a largely unchanging ethos of teaching in the face of a changing ethos of schooling. In the next and final chapter we discuss these power struggles and the tensions surrounding teachers' freedom and authority as they reflect systemic and ongoing tensions. We view these tensions as fundamental in imagining future directions of the occupation of schoolteaching and the ethos of schooling.

9

Conclusion: Facing the Structural Strains of the Occupation

In researching and writing this book, we have attempted to extend an inquiry started more than 30 years ago by Lortie. In *Schoolteacher*, Lortie (1975) laid the foundations for our understanding of teachers' experience and work. His research greatly advanced the field's understanding of what it means to be a teacher in American society. It also suggested the scope and complexity inherent in trying to define the ethos of teaching and indicated the need for additional inquiries.

The ethos of teaching, as Lortie (1975) pointed out, has "deep roots in the history and social position of the occupation" (p. 229). It has also been defined by characteristics identified by Lortie, such as conservatism, individualism, and presentism. Although these concepts extend our understanding of the occupational subculture of teaching, they do not explain the entire phenomenon of teachers' work. In interpreting our research for this study, we have attempted to extend the understanding of the ethos of teaching, specifically by examining it in relation to the ethos of schooling.

We have concluded, as did Lortie (1975), that the teaching occupation contains constants that transcend different historical periods in important ways. For example, the fact that teaching as an occupation emphasizes psychic rather than material rewards reinforces teachers' individualistic orientations. In turn, individualism and the "front-loaded nature of the career system [support] presentism by inhibiting work with others in a search for common solutions" (p. 212).

We suspect that this was true of the teaching profession in the 19th century as well as today.

Even though much of the ethos of teaching remains constant, at another level the teaching profession has been subject to significant historical forces. As demonstrated in this work, teachers' ability to exercise what they regard as the freedom, authority, and power appropriate for their work has been greatly affected since the mid-1960s as the ethos of schooling has been changed and redefined.

The information we gathered for this study has convinced us of the extent to which stability and change together shape and influence what it means to be a teacher. Sentiments of the type discovered by Lortie, such as conservatism, individualism, and presentism, are less likely to be affected or influenced by historical forces of change within the culture than are the constructs of freedom, authority, and power. These factors also must be added to the equation of what it means to be a teacher in American society and what is meant by the ethos of teaching—the fundamental characteristics of the occupation.

We have tried to extend the inquiry about the nature of teachers' work begun by Lortie more than a quarter-century ago. By exploring questions related to freedom, authority, and power, and by examining what teachers understand as the meaning of schooling and the role of the teacher, we have attempted to further clarify what it is to be a teacher by elucidating the forces that shape and define the occupation.

We learned that although the ethos of teaching—why teachers enter the profession and engage in the work of educating young people—remains the same as in the past, the conditions in which teachers work, the expectations and realities of what they do, have changed since the early 1960s.

We have examined in detail how teachers address the realities of freedom, authority, and power in the context of a new and changing ethos of schooling. Like Lortie, we are convinced that teachers have been subject to a profound "structural strain," which makes their work significantly more difficult today than it was in the past. As the ethos of teaching was transformed over the 20 years between 1964 and 1984, so did teachers' status in school affairs change in the minds of the teachers we interviewed (Lortie, 1986).

Many complex forces have contributed to the changing ethos of schooling and in turn have shaped the reality of being a teacher. Desegregation, shifting political power, increases in students' rights and freedoms, legislated mandates, and major changes in the structure of families, work, and the media have all affected the choices, the school culture, and the negotiated environment in which teachers work.

Even so, the redefinition of teachers' status in school affairs has not diminished their intrinsic motivation to teach.

The teachers' desire to "reach out to children"—to make a difference in their lives—remains the single most important reason why they are in the profession. In this respect, teachers have remained the same since the 1960s. What has changed, as a result of the changing ethos of schooling, is the teachers' potential to reach students as easily or as effectively as they could in the past.

The research for this study has led us to ask a number of questions about contemporary teachers in relation to the changing ethos of schooling. How does the changing ethos of schooling affect teachers' freedom to teach? How does the changing ethos of schooling affect teachers' authority to teach? How does the changing ethos of schooling affect teachers' power to teach? Answering these questions has been the main purpose of the previous six chapters. Taken together, however, these three questions brought us to a larger and more general question: How has the changing ethos of schooling reshaped what it means to be a teacher, and what does this change imply for the future of the occupation?

We attempt to address this question on the basis of our analysis of the data for this study. Then we turn to a related question: How does the ethos of teaching affect attempts to change the ethos of schooling?

SCHOOLTEACHING RESHAPED

How has the changing ethos of schooling reshaped teaching, and what does this mean for the future of the occupation?

This question is a difficult question to answer because ultimately it depends on the attitudes toward freedom, authority, and power held by each of the four types of teachers. Throughout the literature, writers including Lortie, have attempted to describe the "modal teacher." This tendency sometimes distorts the reality of schools and teaching by making all teachers into modal teachers. Yet according to what we have discovered about an issue such as teachers' freedom, which exposes differences among teachers, it is hard to fathom a modal teacher's understanding of freedom because no single approach can work for all, or even most, teachers. In this case a modal representation probably would obscure the insights that flow from teachers' differences. As we have shown, however, in the case of teachers' power, a modal teacher's impressions are meaningful for some issues. In these cases, where we find overwhelming consensus for a particular slant on the situation, the differences reveal nuances

that supplement a modal understanding. In exploring teachers' authority, we find that both modal teachers' impressions and teachers' differences offer important perspectives.

Lortie (1975) identified endemic uncertainties as a set of conflicts that teachers face. We believe, on the basis of our analyses, that teachers will find their role uncertain in differing ways and subject to considerable negotiation in differing ways depending on their orientation.

Our research suggests clearly that different types of teachers have responded in significantly different ways to the changing ethos of schooling. Although different types may demonstrate consensus on problems and issues that confront them as a result of this new ethos, they also may define good practice and how to share their understanding of good practice in significantly different ways. Thus we believe that more attention must be devoted to possible differences among teachers. Again, even when teachers express agreement on an issue, the consensus may have different underlying meanings. Teachers may agree very strongly on a statement about "reaching students," but on the basis of our identification of different types of teachers as related to teachers' freedom, we believe that teachers can mean very different things by "reaching students." Despite an apparent consensus, the differences show us that such consensus is only a veneer.

In this case, not only is there a structural strain in the relationship between teachers and the forces at work in the schools; a strain also exists among the four different types of teacher. Because of fundamental differences in how the four types view the world and the occupation of teaching, we seriously question the feasibility of innovations such as school-based management, whereby various teachers in collaboration with their school's parents and administrators are expected to reach consensus on the operation of the school.

All types of teachers struggle with the phenomenon of legislated learning, as we have shown elsewhere (McCloskey et al., 1987, 1991). This is probably the case because of what Wise (1979) identified as the rationalistic assumptions of this phenomenon:

1. The child is pliable, at least within the range of normal aptitude and normal expectations.
2. The teacher is pliable and will modify his or her behavior to comply with legislation, court orders, regulations, or scientific knowledge about education.
3. A science of education exists which yields treatments that can be applied by teacher to student.

4. If shown the way, people prefer cost-effective behavior over behavior which is not cost effective. (p. 57)

According to these rationalistic assumptions, there exist a modal teacher and a modal student for whom reforms and other changes can be designed. As a result of our analysis of the different teacher types, and of the issues of choice, school culture, and the negotiated teaching environment, we see legislated learning as a vehicle for bringing the new ethos of schooling into schools and classrooms. One of the problems with this changing ethos is its nature as a "one size fits all" experience. Legislated learning also exposes the new ethos of schooling as presuming overrational settings; thus, in Wise's (1979) terminology, this ethos is a "hyperrationalization" (p. 48).

Johnson (1990) stated that as long as this treatment of teachers as an undifferentiated group continues, "policies will continue to be devised for the average and the least able" (p. 342). As Lortie (1986) noted, a work situation that does not recognize the difference between average and very good, between least and most able, is conductive to structural strain. Thus, although structural strain grew out of past definitions of status, the new ethos of schooling reinforces the status problems and increases the strain because it assumes an undifferentiated group of teachers.

The "one size fits all" approach fosters "management" of schools over "teaching." According to McNeil (1988), this approach increases the "contradictions of control" and exposes the new ethos of schooling as "insensitive to balance education and control goals in public schools" (p. 209). McNeil identified "defensive teaching" (p. 210) as a result of such a phenomenon. This can be defined as teachers' choosing "methods of presentation and evaluation that they hope will make their workload more efficient and create as little student resistance as possible" (p. 158). Our analyses have revealed situations in which defensive teaching has become a norm. Thus when different types of teachers are treated unrealistically as all the same, as in experiencing the new ethos of schooling, they respond in the same, highly negative way, with defensive teaching.

Further, we believe that the range of values represented by the various teacher types makes it difficult, although not impossible, for various types of teachers to reach common ground on approaches to problems in their schools. Because of differences in ways of approaching the world, often a plurality rather than a majority is all that can be mustered to shape a decision. How will that plurality be grounded so as not to distance one group of teachers too far from the others? How can group consensus be more than a compromise that

is somewhat unacceptable to everyone involved? These questions remain unanswered because approaches to implementing the new ethos of schooling have masked the differences among those who participate in the ethos of teaching.

In earlier work (Provenzo et al., 1989) on teachers' metaphors, we identified teachers as struggling with issues concerning not only what it means to be a teacher, but also what their colleagues are about, as well as the nature and purpose of schooling. Our analyses here have shown us that the changing ethos of schooling has increasingly forced teachers into confronting these issues and devising metaphorical means of understanding them. We believe this is so because there are no easy answers to the problems posed. We are convinced, for example, that in some ways the ethos of teaching is in conflict with the orientations and sentiments of the current ethos of schooling.

Teachers, however, harbor a metaphorical conception that creates a negative approach to their circumstances, namely the hope for a return to "the golden age of schooling." The changes wrought by the new ethos of schooling have made it impossible to return to a golden age of schooling, no matter how desirable that return might be, if such an age ever had existed. We believe that the conflicts we have identified as facing teachers as a result of the current ethos of schooling will remain, and must be considered as endemic in their situation. Larger cultural issues of violence, media influence, and changing family values will continue to affect schools and, in turn, teachers' experience. At best, things will stabilize, but there will be no return to a golden age.

Efforts at reform will continue, but they will fail if they try to control teachers and their work with no understanding of the complexity that teachers face in their occupation and the variety in the teaching population itself. Whether or not reform is successful, outside forces will make choices that will seek to control, or at least influence, teachers' realities. Our analyses dispose us to see teachers' desire for a golden age as a response to the experience of being controlled. Because the ethos of teaching is so stable, we recognize that the ethos of schooling cannot control teachers but can only influence them and their orientations and sentiments. By changing their metaphor or image, teachers may be able to learn from this relationship of ethoses; they may learn to view the tension not as a conflict to wish away but as a dialectical relationship in which they can seek greater avenues of influence and affect the ethos of schooling. Yet if it is possible to envision a dialectic rather than a conflict of ethoses, teachers must envision in some metaphorical way a positive, more future-oriented image for the school culture.

THE ETHOS OF TEACHING SHAPING THE ETHOS OF SCHOOLING

Throughout this work we have assumed that the ethos of schooling has shaped the ethos of teaching. We have not asked how the ethos of teaching affects the ethos of schooling—and in turn the possibilities of reinventing the schools.

This question is critical in light of recent attempts to reform the schools. We believe that school reform that does not take teachers' character and nature into account—teachers' types and attitudes—is doomed to failure. Reform cannot simply be mandated. As suggested by our experience in studying legislated learning, true and lasting reform must come at the level of the classroom and the teacher; it cannot be mandated from above. Teachers may comply technically with requirements imposed from above, but they will do no more than they must in light of their attitudes about personal freedom, authority, and power.

Why should teachers' attitudes about freedom, authority, and power be of any concern in implementing the ethos of schooling? This ethos attempts to educate students as well as assisting in the socialization or social control of younger members of society. As McNeil (1988) pointed out, "The teacher-level perspective is so important because it is at this level that the contradictions of the social control purposes and the educative purposes of schools are resolved" (p. 210). She added that these two purposes are not "loosely coupled," as many people have thought. She regarded them as conflicting and sometimes as contradicting one another:

> The control goals center on aggregates of students and routinized procedures for dealing with them. The educational goals imply unpredictable outcomes among students who as individuals vary in abilities, interests and development. The teachers are at the juncture of these two purposes. (p. 210)

The tensions that teachers expressed in our analyses support this view. At this point, the teachers' voice, however, is missing from the shaping of the ethos of schooling. No one seems to ask how things are going in the move toward a new ethos of schooling. When this question is not asked, the conflicts and contradictions at this juncture of the educative and the control purposes of schooling are not considered. When the conflicts are not recognized, they cannot be ameliorated. In short, if the ethos of schooling is to change successfully, the

ethos of teaching and the role of teachers at this crucial point in the implementation process must be recognized as important.

We believe that administrators and policymakers understand too little about the ethos of teaching to successfully integrate its reality into current efforts at reform. In addition to "one size fits all" approaches, those who are shaping the new ethos of schooling take a rationalistic, "linear" approach to change. When change agents consider teachers, they think only of a modal teacher. There is no linear, uniform way, however, to aggregate the teacher types we have identified. We see these differences and the understanding that administrators and legislators can acquire as a means of understanding some of the complexity in students and in other factors in schools. Through the metaphors of choice, school culture, and negotiated environment, teachers have spoken about the complexity they experience.

In relation to the ethos of schooling, this point tells us that if schools are to change in meaningful ways, teachers and their operative role in their occupation must be understood and changed as well. We would suggest that the knowledge needed for this is inadequate at the present, but that it is time to begin. One way to begin is to encourage teachers to confront their differences and conflicts among themselves. Although we have seen these differences in our analyses, very few teachers seem to speak of them explicitly. In times when reforms work at improving teachers' role, Johnson (1990) observed that as teachers

> gradually change their roles and assume more responsibility for their schools and their profession, [they] will inevitably confront the differences that have been politely discounted or downplayed for a long time. (p. 342)

According to our analyses, although teachers do not realize it, the differences among them contribute to the problems they encounter in facing the new ethos of schooling. Thus teachers collectively must seek forums in which to explore and confront the conflicts originating with their differences. The discounting and the downplaying of conflict are part of the reason why teachers are having difficulty in affecting the ethos of schooling.

How can this happen? We believe that unions and other professional organizations can play a new role in providing safe places to explore differences and to seek common ground. This will probably be difficult because of the competitive, adversarial aspects that have marked union and professional organizing in all fields. The differ-

ences we have observed show us that no natural strong majority or consensus is possible, and that providing a safe ground for confronting differences will be very difficult. Yet the strength that can be created by gathering different types of teachers in a sense of common purpose is probably the only way to transform conflict into a dialectic force for the creation of better schools. Failure to confront and deal with differences among teachers is most likely to preclude any real impact on the ethos of schooling. As a result, the ethos of teaching probably will continue to be compromised by the ethos of schooling, and the outcome will be greater structural strain of the type that Lortie (1986) identified.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Our suggestions are necessarily modest. Teachers have the freedom to change, but they must recognize that change that fully reflects the complexity of schooling must take the form of a dialectic process—one in which the ethos of schooling and the ethos of teaching confront one another. Like Greene (1988), we ultimately believe that this dialectical process is both necessary and liberating:

> There is, after all, a dialectical relation marking every human situation: the relation between subject and object, individual and environment, self and society, outsider and community, living consciousness and phenomenal world. (p. 8)

In addition:

> [T]here are ambiguities of various kinds, layers of determinateness. Freedom, like autonomy, is in many ways dependent on understanding these ambiguities, developing a critical distance with respect to them. Even when understood, however, even when analyzed, they still exist as factors (more or less repressed) in a human career. (p. 9)

If teachers are to gain the freedom (of whichever type) they desire, they must find profitable ways to confront the conflicts. In experiencing the ambiguities and uncertainties of schoolteaching amid pressures and forces caused by the new ethos of schooling, teachers constantly face structural strains in the dilemmas they encounter. We think that both preservice and veteran teachers can begin to understand these difficulties by exploring the dilemmas, which reveal the dialectical relation between the ethos of schooling and the ethos

of teaching, between the purposes of social control and of education. As Cuban (1992) observed, "Dilemmas are conflict-filled situations that require choices because competing, highly prized values cannot be satisfied" (p. 6). Choice is the metaphor on which teachers agree in regard to increasing their freedom in schools. By starting with this agreement on choice as expressed in dilemmas, teachers may begin to work together on their differences.

Rather than hoping that professional status will be improved miraculously from within the teachers' ranks, or conceding that teachers will be overwhelmed by external change, we must recognize teachers' characteristics in their facing of teaching dilemmas related to freedom and choice, authority and school culture, and power and negotiation. Maybe then the structural strain can be reduced through understanding the conflicts, clashes, contradictions, dialectics, and dilemmas encountered both by teachers and by their colleagues and superiors. Maybe, as Cuban (1992) argued, further:

> [S]erious scholarly examination of the uncertainties, ambiguities and moral dilemmas of teaching students at different levels of formal schooling is precisely one basis for assembling intellectual communities among educators. (p. 9)

We believe that such a model is vital to the future development of teaching in the United States, and ultimately to the improvement and reform of our schools. We hope that this book represents a useful step not only in continuing the dialogue, but also in understanding teachers' work, and the dialectical, often strained, relationship that their work has with the nature of schools.

Appendix A

Interview Questions

Origins of the Decision to Become a Teacher

1. How old were you when you decided to become a teacher? What were the major attractions that teaching held for you at the point when you decided to enter the profession?
2. Did you seriously consider other occupations as career possibilities? If so, what and why did they attract you?

Conception of the Teaching Profession

3. In what way is teaching different from what you expected when you made the decision to go into the field? How is it better or worse than you anticipated?

   Probe: Differences between your preteaching expectations and your early teacher experience. Then indicate changes between preteaching expectations and realities over course of career.
4. We hear a lot about teacher problems, but there are 2.1 million people working as teachers. What do you think attracts and holds people in public school teaching?
5. To be a good teacher requires both a knowledge base and certain skills and attitudes. What kind of knowledge do you think a teacher must possess—what does he or she have to know to be able to do a good job? What skills must he or she possess—what must he or she be able to do—to do a good job? What kind of attitudes must he or she exhibit?

Conception of Self as Teacher

6. Please describe one of your own teachers whom you considered outstanding. Are there any teachers with whom you work or have worked that you consider outstanding? Would you describe one for me?
7. Now and then, teachers have a really good day. Could you tell me what a good day is like for you? What happens? What doesn't happen?
8. Sometimes teachers have bad days. What happens on a bad day? How many bad days do you recall in the last 2 weeks?
9. What do you try most to achieve as a teacher? What are you really trying to do most of all?
10. How important is it for you to teach your particular grade level or your particular subject? How painful would it be if you were required to change grade level or subject area?
11. What are the main ways you monitor how well you are teaching? Have your methods of self-assessment changed over time?
    Probe: Student focus? Self-focus? Is it difficult to assess your teaching? If so, why is it difficult?
12. For you, what are the really important satisfactions that you receive from your work? Were any of these unexpected? Have the things that bring you satisfaction changed over time? Has your level of satisfaction changed over time?
13. What are the things that you like least about teaching? The things that bother you most about your work? Have these changed over the course of your career?
14. What are your greatest strengths as a teacher? Shortcomings?
15. What experiences have most influenced the way you teach? How have family and personal issues affected you over time?
16. Here are four descriptions of teachers. Which is most like you?
    Card
17. What kind of reputation do you have with your students? How has this reputation changed over the course of your career? Would you like to have a different reputation among students?
18. What kind of reputation do you have with your peers and principal? Has this changed over time?
19. Are you active in professional organizations and other activities associated with teaching? What specifically? Has your involvement in such activities changed over time?
    Probe: Include union. Seek rewards received in activities.
20. What are your major interests and activities outside of teaching?

Probe: Second jobs, especially if it seems that more energy goes into the second job than into teaching; competing family issues.

21. Have the conditions of work changed over your career as a teacher?

    Probe: How have these changes affected your work with students?

22. Who do you turn to for instructional assistance and inspiration? Who provides you with emotional supports and "strokes"?

23. Who has the real power in your school? Who decides the important issues that affect what you do in the classroom? To whom are you accountable? How has your control over your own teaching changed over the course of your teaching career?

24. If you could imagine the ideal principal, what would you like that person to be like?

    Probes: What would he or she do? What difference would that make to your teaching?

25. What about (name of the school's principal) as a principal?

    Probe: What do you think ———— tries to accomplish as a principal?

26. We've been talking about different approaches to education, different outcomes that people value for students. What do you think of————'s view about how education should take place?

    Probes: What do you think that means?
    Does ———— have any long-range goals for the school?
    Has ———— had any influence on what you do in the classroom? Can you give me a specific example?

27. How much does ———— know about what you are doing in the classroom? How does he or she know?

    Probes: Does ———— visit your classroom?
    Does ———— talk with you about your teaching?
    Do you turn in lesson plans? What happens to them?
    How is ———— involved in your professional development (including but not limited to staff development)?

28. The principal is often not the only person at a school who acts as an instructional leader. Who else at your school does this? What do they do?

    Probes: Is there a certain person or committee that you see about instructional issues (e.g., for advice to obtain materials)?

29. In what ways, if any, have the values and attitudes of your students and their parents changed? If there have been major changes, how have they affected your approaches to curriculum, instruction, and students?
30. Teachers have always been vulnerable to outside attacks, demands, and pressures. What conditions of the 1980s, if any, make teachers especially vulnerable? What particular conditions render you powerless to protect yourself?
31. Teachers are being blamed today for lower test scores and a general level of "mediocrity" in the schools. How do you feel about these criticisms?

    Probe: If mediocrity does, in fact, exist, what factors do you think contribute to it? What can be done about it?
32. Teacher education is also under attack today. Critics say that it fails to prepare teachers adequately. Were you prepared adequately? How do you think teachers should be trained at the preservice level? What should in-service training provide for experienced teachers and how should it be provided?
33. There is a lot of talk today about teacher incentives and rewards. If you could restructure an incentive and reward program for teachers, what would it look like? What kinds of incentives and rewards personally motivate you?
34. As part of the incentives and rewards discussion, we hear a great deal about merit pay. What does merit pay mean to you, and how do you feel about it? If some form of merit pay were inevitable, how would you like to see it implemented? Do you see the idea of merit pay as compatible with the fundamental nature of teaching as an occupation or with the sense of "mission" that many teachers have toward their work?

    Probes: What could society do that would show a high regard and respect for teachers? Changes required? What could central office personnel and building principals do that would best show their high regard and respect for teachers?
35. Here is a list of major events and trends of the past two decades. Would you comment on whether or not each has directly influenced your work as a teacher? How?

    Card
36. There are currently a number of specific proposals being made to improve education. Would you give me your views on the following clusters of recommendations?

    Card

Summarizing Questions

37. What have you gained or lost by being a teacher rather than being in some other occupation? If you could do it over again, would you still choose to be a teacher? If not, what other occupation would you chose?
38. Where do you hope to be professionally in 5 years? In 10 years?
39. What do you have to say to young people who are considering going into the teaching profession today? To first-year teachers? What suggestions do you have for attracting bright and committed people to teaching?

Optional Questions

40. How would you respond if your daughter decided to be a teacher? Your son?
41. If funding were provided, would you send your children to a public or private school?
42. Are there any comments you would like to make, given the purpose of our study as you understand it?
43. Are there any "nagging" questions about teaching that you would like to get answers for?

Appendix B

Interviewees' Citations

The following is a list of the 73 interviewees by teacher type. They are listed by the pseudonym and descriptor identification used throughout the text. The descriptor identifications are followed by the numbers of the page on which citations are located for each interviewee.

Each of the quotes from the interviews is identified by a number assigned to each interviewee and a designation for sex, ethnicity (Black, Hispanic, White), school grade level (elementary, junior, senior), school socioeconomic level (low, medium, high), and interviewee's teaching area.

Teacher Type 1: Teachers Seeking the Freedom to Be Student-Centered

Benjamin (05, M, W, Elem/H, Phys.Ed.) 26, 70–71, 148, 150–151
Barbara (08, F, B, Jr/H, Spec.Ed./V.E.) 68, 120, 134
Bette (09, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten) 25
Brenda (11, F, W, Elem/H, Primary) 25, 69, 121, 149
Catherine (13, F, W, Jr/L, 6th) 66–67, 68, 97, 108, 119, 134, 135, 146
Charles (15, M, W, Sr/L, Gen.Sci.) 128
Donald (18, M, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.) 26, 102, 129, 149, 152
Gertrude (24, F, W, Elem/L, Primary) 27, 71–72, 102–103, 129, 130, 132
Gloria (25, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.) 26, 31, 131, 145, 146
Helen (27, F, W, Elem/M, 2nd) 131
Hope (28, F, B, Sr/M, Math./Geom.) 120, 122, 134
Janice (32, F, W, Elem/M, 4th) 145
Joan (33, F, W, Sr/M, Sci.Bio.) 65, 109, 147

Karen (35, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.) 24–25, 29, 101, 134
Kelly (36, F, W, Elem/L, Spec.Ed./L.D.) 29, 105
Louis (39, M, W, Sr/L, Industrial Arts) 145
Monica (48, F, H, Elem/M, 6th) 131–132, 147
Nancy (49, F, W, Jr/M, Soc.Stud.) 25, 108, 109–110, 134, 145, 146, 152
Nelly (50, F, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.) 27, 121, 129, 145, 147–148
Nicholas (51, M, W, Sr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.) 120, 126, 128, 135, 146, 148
Oscar (52, M, H, Jr/H, Gen.Math.) 26–27, 126, 145, 148
Patricia (55, F, W, Sr/L, Spec.Ed./V.E.) 30, 72, 100, 106, 146, 147
Paula (56, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten) 28–29, 30, 67–68, 72, 97, 98, 125, 131, 132
Phyllis (57, F, W, Elem/M, Kindergarten) 126, 134, 152
Ruth (61, F, W, Elem/H, Kindergarten) 71, 105, 124–125, 146
Shirley (67, F, B, Sr/M, Phys.Ed.) 25
Sonia (68, F, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts/Eng.) 27–28, 31, 123–124
Teresa (70, F, H, Elem/L, Spec.Span.) 119
Victoria (71, F, B, Sr/M, Spec.Ed./L.D.) 30, 67, 69, 120, 146
Wendy (72, F, W, Elem./H, Librarian) 129, 134

Teacher Type 2: Teachers Seeking the Freedom of Subject Matter Status

Agnes (04, F, B, Jr/L, Lang.Arts/Eng.) 33, 34, 35, 77, 104, 107–108, 110, 148, 150
Albert (02, M, H, Sr/H, Phys.Ed.) 35, 99, 120–121, 129–130, 131
Anna (03, F, H, Jr/L, Gen.Sci.) 119
Audrey (06, F, H, Elem/M, Spec.Ed./Vis.) 34, 35–36
Bonnie (10, F, W, Sr/M, Soc.Stud./His.) 33, 36, 77–78, 104, 105
Bridget (12, F, B, Elem/H, 2nd) 34, 120, 146
Cecilia (14, F, B, Elem/M, 3rd) 35, 121
Deborah (17, F, W, Elem/L, 4th) 36, 123
Francine (20, F, W, Elem/H, 2nd) 36, 130, 134
Garry (23, M, W, Jr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.) 34, 79–80, 101, 103, 105–106, 122–123, 128–129, 145
George (22, M, H, Sr/M, Phys.Ed./Dri.Ed.) 35, 121, 145, 146
Grace (21, F, H, Jr/M, 6th) 145, 146
Harry (29, M, B, Sr/M, Soc.Stud./Civ./Gov.) 33, 79, 103, 127, 134
Ingrid (30, F, W, Sr/H, Lang.Arts/Eng.) 146
John (31, M, W, Jr/L, Gen.Sci.) 34
Linda (38, F, W, Sr/L, Fine Arts/Art) 33, 36, 122, 151–152

Lucy (40, F, W, Elem/H, 2nd) 119
Margaret (41, F, W, Jr/M, Basic Math.) 98, 123, 149–150
Mark (42, M, W, Sr/H, Soc.Stud.) 34, 43, 73, 75–76
Mary (47, F, W, Sr/H, Gen.Sci.) 73, 74–75, 76, 101, 108, 123, 126, 146
Matthew (45, M, B, Jr/L, Soc.Stud./Civ./Gov.) 123, 150
Olivia (53, F, H, Jr/L, Gen.Math.) 80
Roberta (59, F, B, Jr/H, Spec.Ed./L.D.) 76–77, 80, 105, 109, 119–120
Sharon (64, F, W, Elem/H, Spec.Ed./L.D.) 98, 125
Sheila (66, F, W, Elem/H, 4th) 145
Sylvia (69, F, W, Jr/M, Spec.Ed./V.E.) 131, 145
William (73, M, W, Sr/L, Phys.Ed./Health) 35, 73, 75, 78–79, 80, 100, 127, 132, 135, 147

Teacher Type 3: Teachers Seeking the Freedom to Create Microworlds

Alice (01, F, W, Jr/M, Gen.Math.) 39, 96, 100, 106, 107, 108, 122, 127, 129, 135
Brian (07, M, W, Sr/L, Gen.Sci.) 81–82, 137
Diane (19, F, W, Elem/H, 3rd) 38, 82–83, 133
Harriet (26, F, W, Elem/L, 4th) 37, 83–84, 128, 129
June (34, F, W, Sr/H, Media Spec.) 127, 145–146
Leo (37, M, W, Sr/M, Lang.Arts) 37, 85, 103, 122, 131, 151
Michael (46, M, B, Elem/M, Phys.Ed.) 124, 127, 129, 149
Peter (54, M, B, Sr/L, Fine Arts/Music) 37
Richard (60, M, W, Elem/L, Phys.Ed.) 39, 82
Sally (62, F, W, Jr/H, Math./Arith.) 119
Stanley (65, M, W, Jr/H, Sci.Bio.) 39, 86, 121, 125,129, 132–133, 134–135

Teacher Type 4: Teachers Teaching by Happenstance

Clara (16, F, B, Elem/M, Intermediate) 86–87, 136–137
Maria (43, F, B, Elem/M, 4th) 41, 88–89, 138, 146
Martha (44, F, H, Elem/M, 3rd) 41, 147
Rita (58, F, B, Elem/L, Kindergarten) 40–41, 88, 137
Sandra (63, F, B, Elem/H, Spec.Ed./V.E.) 41, 145

References

Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. (Ed.). (1982). *Cultural and economic reproduction in education: Essays on class, ideology and the state*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M.W., & Weis, L. (Eds.). (1983). *Ideology and practice in schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Arendt, H. (1977). *Between past and future*. New York: Penguin. (Original work published 1968)

Bailyn, B. (1960). *Education in the forming of American society*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.

Bellah, R.N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W.M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S.M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Benne, K.D. (1970). Authority in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 40*(3), 385–410.

Benne, K.D. (1990). *The task of post-contemporary education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bryant. A. (1977). *The Anita Bryant story: The survival of our nation's families and the threat of militant homosexuality*. Old Tappan, NJ: Revell.

Burbules, N.C. (1986). A theory of power in education. *Educational Theory, 36*(2), 95–114.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Author.

Chubb, J.E., & Moe, T.M. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute.

Cohn, M.M., & Kottkamp, R.B. (1993). *Teachers: The missing voice in education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Cohn, M.M., Kottkamp, R.B., McCloskey, G.N., & Provenzo, E.F., Jr. (1987). *Teachers' perspectives on problems of their profession: Implications for policymakers and practitioners*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of

184

Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 286 828)

Cohn, M.M., Kottkamp, R.B., & Provenzo, E.F., Jr. (1986a, March). *Merit pay: Why teachers don't want it*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Miami Beach, FL.

Cohn, M.M., Kottkamp, R.B., & Provenzo, E.F., Jr. (1986b, March). *Toward an understanding of teachers who remain "enthusiastic" about teaching: Insights from interviews*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Cohn, M.M., McCloskey, G.N., Kottkamp, R.B., & Provenzo, E.F., Jr. (1988, April). *Teacher perspectives on their interpersonal relationships in the school: A focus on peers and principals*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Coleman, J.S. (1987). Families and schools. *Educational Researcher, 16*(6), 32–38.

Cremin, L.A. (1970). *American education: The colonial experience, 1607–1783*. New York: Harper & Row.

Cremin, L.A. (1976). *Public education*. New York: Basic Books.

Cremin, L.A. (1980). *American education: The national experience, 1783–1876*. New York: Harper & Row.

Cuban, L. (1992). Managing dilemmas while building professional communities. *Educational Researcher, 21*(1), 4–11.

deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior*. New York: Academic Press.

Education Commission of the States. (1983). *Action for excellence*. Denver, CO: Author.

Freire, P. (1970a). *Cultural action for freedom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Freire, P. (1970b). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Seabury Press.

Gallup, G. H. (1978). *A decade of Gallup polls of attitudes toward education 1969–1978*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Gallup, G.H. (1984). The 16th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 66*(1), 23–38.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Giroux, H.A. (1981). *Ideology, culture and the process of schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Giroux, H.A. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Grant, G. (1988). *The world we created at Hamilton High*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Greene, M. (1973). *Teacher as stranger: Educational philosophy for the modern age*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hawley, W. (1988). Missing pieces of the educational reform agenda: Or why the first and second waves may miss the boat. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 24*(4), 416–437.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Jaeger, W. (1939–1944). *Paideia: The ideals of Greek culture* (3 vols., G. Highet, Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, S.M. (1990). *Teachers at work: Achieving success in our schools*. New York: Basic Books.

Kagan, S.L. (1987). Home-school linkages: History's legacies and the family support movement. In S.L. Kagan (Ed.), *America's family support programs: Perspectives and prospectives* (pp. 161–181). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Klain, J. (Ed.). (1990). *1990 international television and video almanac*. New York: Quigley.

Kottkamp, R.B., Cohn, M.M., McCloskey, G.N., & Provenzo, E.F., Jr. (1987). *Teacher ethnicity: Relationships with teaching rewards and incentives*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 078)

Kottkamp, R.B., Provenzo, E.F., Jr., & Cohn, M.M. (1986a, March). *Individual and school level predictors of teacher attitudes toward merit pay*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Miami Beach, FL.

Kottkamp, R.B., Provenzo, E.F., Jr., & Cohn, M.M. (1986b, March). *Mid-career development of teachers: Concepts and cases*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Kottkamp, R.B., Provenzo, E.F., Jr., & Cohn, M.M. (1986c). Stability and change in a profession: Two decades of teacher attitudes, 1964–1984. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67*(8), 559–567.

Kreisberg, S. (1992). *Transforming power: Domination, empowerment and education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kundera, M. (1984). *The unbearable lightness of being*. New York: Harper & Row.

Lichty, L. (1981, Winter). Success story. *The Wilson Quarterly, 5*, 53–65.

Lortie, D.C. (1969). The balance of control and autonomy in elementary school teaching. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), *The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers* (pp. 1–53). New York: The Free Press.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lortie, D.C. (1986). Teacher status in Dade County: A case of structural strain? *Phi Delta Kappan, 67*(8), 568–575.

McCloskey, G.N., Provenzo, E.F., Jr., Cohn, M.M., & Kottkamp, R.B. (1987). *A profession at risk: Legislated learning as a disincentive to teaching*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284 844)

McCloskey, G.N., Provenzo, E.F., Jr., Cohn, M.M., & Kottkamp, R.B. (1991). Teacher reactions to legislated learning. *Educational Policy, 5*(3), 251–265.

McNeil, L. (1988). *Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge*. New York: Routledge.

Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Murphy, J. (1990). The educational reform movement of the 1980s: A comprehensive analysis. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases (pp. 3–55). Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative of educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nyberg, D. (1981). *Power over power: What power means in ordinary life, how it is related to acting freely and what it can contribute to a renovated ethics of education*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Nyberg, D., & Farber, P. (1986). Authority in education. *Teachers College Record, 88*(1), 4–14.

Postman, N. (1982). *The disappearance of childhood*. New York: Delacorte Press.

Provenzo, E.F., Jr., McCloskey, G.N., Cohn, M.M., Kottkamp, R.B., & Proller, N. (1987). *A comparison of individual and school level approaches to merit pay: A case study of Dade County public schools*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 292 751)

Provenzo, E.F., Jr., McCloskey, G.N., Kottkamp, R.B., & Cohn, M.M. (1989). Metaphor and meaning in the language of teachers. *Teachers College Record, 90*(4), 551–573.

Provenzo, E.F., Jr., & Provenzo, A.B. (1985). *Education on the forgotten frontier: A centennial celebration, 1885–1985*. Miami, FL: Dade County Public Schools.

Provenzo, E.F., Jr., & Provenzo, A.B. (1988a, May). *The impact of immigration on the Dade County public schools: 1959–1987*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Florida Historical Society, Miami, FL.

Provenzo, E.F., Jr., & Provenzo, A.B. (1988b, April). *School desegregation and the Dade County public schools: The long stall*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Provenzo, E.F., Jr., & Provenzo, A.B. (in preparation). *Education on the forgotten frontier: A history of the Dade County Public Schools, 1885–1985.*

Ravitch, D. (1983). *The trouble crusade: American education, 1945–1980.* New York: Basic Books.

Reagan, E., & Stewart, D. (Eds.). (1978). *The philosophy of Paul Ricouer: An anthology of his work.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Silva, H. (1985). *The children of Mariel: Cuban refugee children in south Florida schools.* Washington, DC: The Cuban American National Foundation.

Stinchcombe, A.L. (1965). Social structure and organizations. In J.G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organizations* (pp. 142–260). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Tocqueville, A. de. (1969). *Democracy in America* (G. Lawrence, Trans., & J.P. Mayer, Ed.). New York: Doubleday Anchor.

Twentieth Century Fund. (1983). *Making the grade.* New York: Author.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (1982). *Confronting racial isolation in Miami.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (1985). *Marital status and living arrangements.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Warren, D. (Ed.). (1989). *American teachers: Histories of a profession at work.* New York: Macmillan.

Wise, A.E. (1979). *Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wise, A.E. (1988). The two conflicting trends in school reform: Legislated learning revisited. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(5), 328–333.

Author Index

A
Apple, M.W., 115, 177
Arendt, H., 63, 177

B
Bailyn, B., 51, 177
Bellah, R.N., 2, 22, 177
Benne, K.D., 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 92, 93, 95, 112, 113, 177
Bryant, A., 177
Burbules, N.C., 116, 142, 177

C
Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 53, 177
Chubb, J.E., 54, 55, 58, 59, 60, 177
Cohn M.M., 1, 14, 17, 18, 19, 30, 38, 42, 43, 44, 78, 90, 119, 130, 132, 133, 140, 141, 144, 160, 162, 177, 178, 179, 180
Coleman, J.S., 8, 9, 178
Cremin, L.A., 2, 3, 4, 54, 178
Cuban, L., 166, 178

D
deCharms, R., 42, 178

E
Education Commission of the States, 52, 178

F
Farber, P., 61, 62, 180
Freire, P., 64, 178

G
Gallup, G.H., 102, 178
Gilligan, C., 20, 178
Giroux, H.A., 115, 178
Grant, G., 1, 2, 62, 103, 178
Greene, M., 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 165, 178, 179

H
Hawley, W., 179
Holmes Group, 53, 179

J
Jaeger, W., 4, 179
Johnson, S.M., 161, 164, 179

K
Kagan, S.L., 179
Klain, J., 9, 179
Kottkamp, R.B., 1, 14, 17, 18, 19, 30, 38, 42, 43, 44, 78, 90, 119, 130, 132, 133, 140, 141, 144, 160, 162, 177, 178, 179, 180
Kreisberg, S., 156, 179
Kundera, M., 22, 179

L
Lichty, L., 10, 179
Lortie, D.C., 1, 3, 4, 5, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 59, 91, 96,

110, 135, 141, 144, 146, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 161, 165, 179

M
Madsen, R., 2, 22
McCloskey, G.N., 17, 18, 19, 30, 42, 44, 78, 119, 130, 132, 133, 141, 144, 160, 162, 177, 178, 179, 180
McNeil, L., 161, 163, 180
Moe, T.M., 54, 55, 58, 59, 60, 177
Morgan, G., 95, 180
Murphy, J., 52, 53, 54, 57, 180

N
National Commission on Excellence in Education, 52, 180
Noddings, N., 25, 180
Nyberg, D., 61, 62, 115, 116, 117, 118, 124, 126, 127, 128, 130, 133, 135, 136, 142, 155, 180

P
Postman, N., 10, 180
Proller, N., 133, 180
Proller, R.N., 144
Provenzo, A.B., 12, 180, 181
Provenzo, E.F., Jr., 1, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 30, 38, 42, 43, 44, 78, 90, 119, 130, 132, 133, 140, 141, 144, 160, 162, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181
Ravitch, D., 5, 6, 7, 181
Reagan, E., 19, 144, 181

S
Silva, H., 13, 181
Stewart, D., 19, 144, 181
Stinchcombe, A.L., 3, 181
Sullivan, W.M., 2, 22

T
Tipton, S.M., 2, 22
Tocqueville, A. de, 2, 181
Twentieth Century Fund, 52, 181

U
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 12, 181
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 8, 99, 181

W
Warren, D., 5, 181
Weiss, L., 115, 177
Wise, A.E., 17, 160, 161, 181

Subject Index

A
Acceding or striving for success, 22
Accountability
  demands for, 130–133
  microworld teachers, 38
  student-centered teachers, 31
  subject matter status teachers, 35
Administrators
  authority, 61
  changing expectations, 30
  losing sense of what schools are about, 27
Anthropogogical authority
  development of critical consciousness, 65
  importance of dialogue in teaching process, 64–65
  student-centered teachers, 65–72
  subject matter status teachers, 72–81
Antinepotism rules, 6
Appropriation, 19
Arendt, H., 21
Athletics, 6
Authoritarianism, 62
Authority
  administrators, 61
  challenges to, 62
  conflicts about, 19
  confusion in meaning, 62
  general public, 61
  local boards of education, 61
  parents, 61
  strains on stability of ethos of teaching, 91
  teachers, 61–63
Authority to teach, 20
  anthropogogical authority, 64–81
  effectively, 89–93
  ethos of schooling, 61–89
  expert authority, 63–64, 81–86
  rule authority, 64

B
Black History Archives, 12
Black History Month, 12
Bookkeeping and excessive paperwork, 30
Bryant, Anita, 12

C
Care, 25
Career ladders, 44
Catalyst, 145
Change, 158
Changing school populations
  desegregation, 108
  different values and work, 107
  mainstreaming special students, 109–110
  new pluralism, 108–109
  racial and ethnic sensitivity, 107–108
  rules and procedures, 107
Civil Rights Act of 1964, 6
Civil rights movement, 5–8
College-level performance tests, 13
Communal forces, 4
Communication of subject matter and ideas, 145

Competing knowledge, 151
Connected teaching, 25
Constrained freedom, 34
Content of teaching, 145–147
Context of schooling, 19
Control
  desire to maintain existing frameworks, 59
  from varying sources, 45
Culture
  definition of, 94
  differences between old new, 95–98
Curriculum makers losing sense of what schools are about, 27

D
Dade County schools
  desegregation, 11–12
  foreign students, 12
  legislated mandates, 13
  political action groups, 12
  students rights and freedom, 12–13
De Toqueville, A., 2
Decent salaries, 134
Decentralized schools, 53
Defensive teaching, 161
Deference, 154
Delivery of services to children, 54
Demands for accountability exchange relations, 130–133
Denial of power, 115
Desegregation, 108
  Dade County schools, 11–12
Development of critical consciousness, 65
Dewey, J., 21
Different students, 124–127
Different values and work, 107
Dilemmas, 165–166
Discipline as grounds for dismissal, 105–106

E
Economic Opportunity Act, 6
Education
  American Civil Rights Movement, 5–8
  antinepotism rules, 6
  athletics, 6
  board member and administrator decision making, 3
  changes from 1964–1984, 4–11
  Civil Rights Act of 1964, 6
  Dade County schools, 11–13
  easing of entry, 3
  Education of All Handicapped Children Act, 7
  femininization, 3
  homosexual faculty members, 12
  household pattern changes, 8–9
  Lau v. Nichols, 6–7
  new politics, 7
  social impact of television, 9–10
Education of All Handicapped Children Act, 7
Educational choice and control, 58–60
Educational reform movement (1980s)
  decentralized schools, 53
  delivery of services to children, 54
  empowerment of teachers, 53
  failure to train for competition with other industrial nations, 52
  improving school standards, 52
  pluralism in education, 54
  repairing systems, 53
  restructuring schools, 53
  school-based management systems, 54–55
  teachers choices, 55–58
  top down, bureaucratic model, 53
Educational support conflicts, 19
Effective teaching environment, 149, 151
Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 6
Emerson, R.W., 21
Environment
  based on context, 151
  creating rapport, 30
Equal rights, 5–6
Ethnic sensitivity, 107–108
Ethos, 2
Ethos of schooling, 1, 20, 158
  American paideia, 3
  authority to teach, 61–86
  communal forces, 4
  confronting ethos of teaching, 165–166
  continuity, 155
  defining, 2–4
  greater demands from public, 45
  habits of the heart, 2–3
  happenstance teachers, 45
  historical precedents, 3
  legislated learning, 161
  metaphors to understand problems, 162

microworld teachers, 45
more inclusive, 10–11
negotiation between old and new, 153–156
new curricula, 45
new paideia shaping, 3–4
power over, 156
power with, 156
reform efforts, 162
reinforcing status problems and increasing strain, 161
reshaping teaching, 159–162
rule authority, 86–89
shaped by ethos of teaching, 163–165
social impact of television, 9–10
strain between old culture and new ethos, 110–113
strain on teachers and new ethos, 17–20
struggles to understand, 19
student-centered teachers, 45
subject matter status teachers, 45
teacher-level perspective, 163
technological culture change, 155
understanding teachers' role, 164
unions, 164–165
Ethos of schoolteaching, 1
Ethos of teaching, 1, 20, 158
administrators and policymakers not understanding, 164
confronting ethos of schooling, 165–166
negotiating strains, 141–142
roots, 157
shaping ethos of schooling, 163–165
strains on stability, 44–49, 91–93
Evaluation, 133–136
Exchange as power
cooperation problems, 118–119
definition of, 118
demands for accountability, 130–133
different students, 124–127
evaluating parents, 129
evaluation, 133–136
false accusations of molestation, 130
lack of interest in student, 128–129
merit pay, 133
negative parental role models, 129
oppositional parents, 127–128
problems with parenting, 128–130
relations with parents, 127
relations with students, 119–127
supportive parents, 128
teaching children to defy law, 129–130
television, 129
unmotivated students, 119–121
uncooperative students, 122–124
Expecting desired freedom, 48
Expert authority, 63–64
microworld teachers, 81–86

F

Failure to train for competition with other industrial nations, 52
Fairness, 134–135
Family problems and students, 126
Fealty, 116
Federal mandates, 131
Fiction, 116
Finance, 116
Flexibility, 149, 151–152
Force, 116
Foreign students, 12
Foucault, M., 21
Freedom
to adapt and change, 26
afforded by status, 22
constrained, 34
definition of, 21
increasing constraints on, 32
negative, 22
open or positive value, 22
subject matter status teachers, 34
to be individual, 35
Freedom to teach, 20, 22
happenstance teachers, 40–42
limitations, 21
microworld teachers, 37–40
reaching young people, 42–44
seeking to be student centered, 23–32
strains on stability of ethos of teaching, 44–49
subject matter status, 33–36
Friere, P., 21
Fromm, E., 21
Frost, Robert, 29

G

General public authority, 61
Golden age of schooling, 95–98
Greater demands from public, 45
Greene, M. and freedom, 21–22

H
Happenstance teachers, 40–42
  assessment evaluations, 47
  choices in educational reform movement, 56
  confusion over role, 88
  desire for rules, 86
  educational choice and control, 58
  ethos of schooling, 45
  hiring to fill emergency, 42
  hollering to establish authority, 87
  lack of structure, 41
  lacking sense of freedom, 88–89
  loss of force, 92
  lost children, 42
  management problems, 40–41
  new curricula, 46
  not viewed as proper teachers, 42
  orientation to individualism, 49
  origin behavior, 42
  parental problems, 41
  pawn behavior, 42
  physical discipline, 87–88
  reaching young people, 42–43
  restructuring schools, 56–57
  rule authority, 65, 86–89
  struggles teaching, 40–41
  threats, 139
  threats as power, 136
  as victim, 87
  weeding out problems with reform, 57–58
  withdrawing from teaching, 88
Hare, R., 21
Hegemony of system, 59
High school performance tests, 13
Hiring to fill emergency, 42
Households, changing patterns of, 8–9

I
Importance of dialogue in teaching process, 64–65
Imposition of standards, 135–136
Improving school standards, 52
Inner character guides, 34
Interaction with other adults, 44
Interferences
  from others, 37
  student-centered teachers, 30–31
Isolation, 40

J
Jefferson, Thomas, 148
Johnson, President Lyndon B., 5
Jones, Johnny, 11

L
Labor force, increased entry of women into, 8
Lack of consensus, 59
Lack of respect for teaching, 102–104
Lack of structure, 41
Lau v. Nichols, 6–7
Learning, importance to future success, 24–25
Legislated learning, 17–19, 160–161
Legislated mandates, 13
Less tolerant of peers, 29
Levi-Strauss, 5
Limitations in freedom to teach, 21
Local boards of education, 61
Lost children, 42
Love, 138–140

M
Mainstreaming special students, 109–110, 126
Management problems, 40–41
McDuffie, Arthur, 12
Merit pay, 133–135
Metaphor, 144
Microworld teachers, 37–40
  absolute control of environment, 81
  accountability pressures, 38
  assessment evaluation, 47
  blatant aggression and manipulation, 84
  boundaries of microworld, 81
  choices in educational reform movement, 56
  defending rules in, 83–84
  educational choice and control, 58
  escaping from external worlds, 85–86
  ethos of schooling, 45
  expert authority, 65, 81–86
  greater scrutiny of, 92
  interference from others, 37
  intimidation, 84
  isolation, 40
  lack of communication with some students and parents, 84–85
  limiting interaction with peers, 37

maintaining authority and control, 82–83
new curricula, 46
not understanding athletics' contribution, 85
orientation to individualism, 49
parent interference, 37
persuasion and love, 139
reaching young people, 42
restructuring schools, 56–57
returning to student compliance, 111
second careers, 40
special environments, 38–39
threats as power 136
weeding out problems with reform, 57–58
Middle school performance tests, 13
Modal teachers, 159–161, 164
Mores, 2

N
Negotiating strains on ethos of teaching, 141–142
Negotiation, 143
bridges to reach students and parents, 152
competing knowledge, 151
content of teaching, 145–147
deference, 154
effective teaching environment, 149–151
environment based on context, 151
flexibility, 149
influence in negotiating change, 154–156
new reality of pluralism, 149–153
new vs. old ethos of schooling, 155–156
power over, 156
power with, 156
reaching all students, 148–149
role in process of teaching, 144–145
roles different than expected, 152
special and personal concerns, 153–154
teacher-student relationships, 147–148
as teachers' metaphor, 144
tolerance, 149
New curricula, 45–46
New pluralism, 108–109
New school culture
adults only concerned about their needs, 103
changing school populations, 106–110
differences from old culture, 95–98
diminishing teachers' authority, 95–96
discipline and need to exercise control, 100–101
education as legal necessity, 100
lack of parent involvement, 99–100
lack of respect for school as workplace, 99–102
lack of respect for work of teaching, 102–104
less connected with culture, 103
parents' view, 98
rooting in community culture, 103–104
societal changes, 97–98
teacher accountability, 104–106
teachers' authority, 94–95
television, 101
undervaluing teachers, 104

O
Objectivity, 135
Openness, 28
Oppositional parents, 127–128
Organization historical precedents, 3
Orientation of individualism, 48–49, 91
Origin behavior, 42
Overemphasis on testing, 131

P
Paideia, 3
Parental problems, 41
Parents
authority, 61
bridges to reach, 152
changing values and realities, 99–100
criticism of lack of involvement, 99
direction and purpose, 67
evaluating, 129
exchange relations with, 127
expectations differing from teachers, 80
interference, 37
lack of communication with, 84–85
lack of interest in student, 128–129
lack of respect for teacher, 80
letting school system handle their responsibilities, 105
negative role models, 129

oppositional, 127–128
problems with parenting, 128–130
reaching out to, 78
supportive, 128
teaching children to defy law, 129–130
trust, 67–68
uncooperative, 78–79
view of new school culture, 98
Pawn behavior, 42
Persistent lightness of being, 22
Personal and academic success, 67
Personal involvement, 25
Persuasion, 138–140
Physical discipline, 87–88
Pluralism, 54, 149–153
changes in rules, 150–151
as constant, 152
negotiating flexibility and tolerance, 149–152
strains on teachers, 151
Political action groups, 12
Political struggles, 59
Power over, 156
Power relationships, 115
Power to teach, 20
denial of power, 115
exchange as power, 117–136
fealty, 116
fiction, 116
finance, 116
force, 116
negotiating, 140–141
persuasion and love, 138–140
power relationships, 115
teacher conceptions of, 117
threats as power, 136–138
Power with, 156
Preferred students, 140–141
Pressure filtering down, 131
Problems with parenting, 128–130
Professionalism, 44
Public Law 94–142, 7, 13

R

Racial sensitivity, 107–108
Reaching out toward possibilities in experience, 22
Reaching young people, 42–44
Relationships of co-agency, 156
Repairing educational systems, 53
Reshaping teaching, 159–162
Restructuring schools, 53, 56–57
Ricoeur, P., 21
Role in process of teaching, 144–145
Rose, W.L., 21
Rule authority, 64
happenstance teachers, 86–89
Rules and procedures, 107

S

Sartre, J.P., 21
School-based management systems, 54–55
School-based reform program, 29
Schools
lack of respect for as workplace, 99–102
reform of, 163
Second careers and microworld teachers, 40
Shelter in private enclaves, 22
Situational alliances, 111–112
Skills testing program, 13
Social capital loss, 8–9
Society
changes from 1964–1984, 4–11, 97–98
civil rights movement, 5–8
household pattern changes, 8–9
increased entry of women into labor force, 8
social change, 6
social impact of television, 9–10
Spanking children, 137
Special environments, 38–39
Special students, 13
mainstreaming, 109–110
Specialized knowledge, 63
Stability, 158
Strains between old culture and new ethos, 110–113
Strains on stability of ethos of teaching, 44
authority, 91
control from varying sources, 45
greater demands from public, 45
happenstance teachers, 92
microworld teachers, 92
new curricula, 45–46
orientation of individualism, 48–49, 91
reduction of authority, 93
student-oriented teachers, 92
subject matter status teachers, 92

subjective warrant, 47–48
teaching as profession or art, 45
universal teaching standards, 92
wide decision range, 46–47
Structural strains of teaching, 15–17, 19, 157–159
different types of teachers, 160
dilemmas, 165–166
historical forces, 158
legislated learning, 17–19, 160–161
relationship between teachers, 160
stability and change, 158
Student-centered teachers
accountability, 31
adapting to students' realities, 26
anthropogogical authority, 65–72
arena for openness closes off another area, 29
assessment evaluation, 47
bookkeeping and excessive paperwork, 30
care, 25
changing administrative expectations, 30
choices in educational reform movement, 55–56
concerns over legal action, 71–72
conflicts, 32
confronting students with consequences of action, 70
connected teaching, 25
consistency, 70
curriculum makers and administrators on schools, 27
discipline problems, 66
distractions created by other, 29
educational choice and control, 58
employing other skills to achieve goal, 27
environment creating rapport, 30
ethos of schooling, 45
facilitative and supportive climate, 65
fair, firm, and friendly, 68
fairness and honesty, 70
forced reeducation, 112
freedom to adapt and change, 26
high expectations from students, 69
hope in past reality, 112
importance of learning to future success, 24–25
importance of subject matter, 26
increasing constraints on freedom, 32
interferences, 30–31
less tolerant of peers, 29
meaningful dialog, 66
naming obstacles, 32
new curricula, 46
not students' friends, 69
openness, 28
orientation to individualism, 48
parent direction and purpose, 67
personal and academic success, 67
personal involvement, 25
persuasion and love, 139–140
possibilities for enhancing choices, 57
pressures on teacher respect, 111
reaching young people, 42
regarding students as children, 32
respect for teachers, 68–69
restrictions against what they can do, 71–72
restructuring schools, 56
rules, 70
school-based reform program, 29
situational alliances, 111–112
student and parent trust, 67–68
student instruction teaching responsibility, 32
students caring about themselves and subjects, 27
students functioning in society, 25
students as primary consideration, 27
students' respect, 68
teamwork, 28
testing authority, 92
theatricality, 70–71
viewing subject matter in new ways, 28
working together with students, 31
working with other teachers, 29
working with parents, 66
Students
affecting lives of, 147
bridges to reach, 152
bypassing difficult, 36
caring about themselves and subjects, 27
confronting with consequences of action, 70
demanding discipline and hard work from, 77–78
development and acquisition of knowl-

edge, 146
different, 124–127
employing other skills to achieve goal, 27
exchange relation with, 119–127
family problems, 126
foundation for, 147–148
functioning in society, 25
getting work out of, 111
high expectations from, 69
instruction teaching responsibility in society, 32
lack of communication with, 84–85
lack of student subject status, 34
learning how to learn, 36
limiting interaction, 36
mainstreaming, 126
negotiating and engaging in subject, 146
participation diminishing, 110–111
preferred, 140–141
as primary consideration, 27
rapport with, 146–147
reaching all, 148–149
reaching out to, 78
regarding as children, 32
relation with, 120
respect for teachers, 68, 147
returning to compliance, 111
rights and freedom, 12–13
rudimentary achievement, 15
as secondary concern, 35
special shaping of, 145
teachers adapting to student realities, 26
teachers being on task and relating personally to, 36
teachers not friends, 69, 76–77
thinking for themselves, 147
trust, 67–68
uncooperative, 122–124
unmotivated, 119–121
working together with, 31
Subject matter
confidence in, 33
conveying, 35
importance of, 26
viewing in new ways, 28
Subject matter status teachers
accountability, 35
anthropogogical authority, 65, 72–81
assessment evaluation, 47
being on task and relating personally to students, 36
better environment for learning, 80–81
bypassing difficult students, 36
challenges to authority, 92
choices in educational reform movement, 55–56
communication levels, 73–74
confidence in subject matter, 33
conveying subject matter, 35
countermanding description of, 79
definite sense of authority, 80
demanding discipline and hard work from students, 77–79
educational choice and control, 58
ethos of schooling, 45
forced reeducation, 112
freedom, 34–35
getting work out of students, 111
good teaching based on endeavor, 73
hope in past reality, 112
inner character guides, 34
knowledge of subject, 33
lack of parental respect, 80
lack of student subject status, 34
limiting students' interaction, 36
lose of exercising authority, 79–80
most memorable teachers, 76
not becoming pal to students, 76–77
orientation to individualism, 48
outstanding teachers as models, 75–76
persuasion and love, 139–140
possibilities for enhancing choices, 57
reaching out to parents and students, 78
reaching young people, 42
rejection of subjects they teach, 75
respect, 74
restructuring schools, 56
sense of humor, 33
situational alliances, 111–112
students as secondary concern, 35
students learning how to learn, 36
teacher expectations differing from parents, 80
as teachers of subject, 72
teaching style as individualistic endeavor, 35
television competition, 74
uncooperative parents, 78–79

Subjective warrant, 47–48
Supportive parents, 128

T
Teacher accountability, 104–106
Teacher-student relationships, 147–148
Teachers
  appropriation, 19
  authority, 61–63
  authority in new school culture, 94–95
  authority to teach, 20
  changes in attitudes, 17
  characteristics of, 145
  choices in educational reform movement, 55–58
  conceptions of power to teach, 117
  conflicts about authority and educational support, 19
  conflicts facing, 160
  context of schooling, 19
  criticizing lack of parental involvement, 99
  declines in satisfaction levels, 15
  defining clear role for themselves, 19
  developing student rudimentary achievement, 15
  differences in goals, 44
  different types of, 160–161
  difficulty in assessing ability, 47
  diminishing authority, 95–96
  distractions created by other, 29
  educational attainments, 14
  educational choice and control, 58–60
  empowerment, 53
  ethnic and racial composition, 14
  ethos of schooling, 20
  ethos of teaching, 20
  evaluation systems, 18
  exchange as power, 118–136
  expectations differing from parents, 80
  expectations of others, 48
  false accusations of molestation, 130
  freedom to teach, 20
  happenstance, 40–42
  influence in negotiating change, 154–156
  lack of choice, 60
  lacking power to control, 136
  limiting interaction with peers, 37
  long time period deciding on becoming, 46–47
  microworld, 37–40
  modal, 159–161, 164
  most salient rewards, 14
  no-nonsense, get-the-learning-of-subject-matter-done, 15
  not viewed as proper, 42
  pluralism strains on, 151
  population changes, 14
  power in negotiated environment, 143–156
  power to teach, 20, 115–141
  preferred students, 140–141
  pressures on teacher respect, 111
  pseudonyms for, 20
  reaching young people, 42–44
  reduction of authority, 93
  relationship between, 160
  relationship to system, 145
  respect for, 68–69
  role in process of teaching, 144–145
  roles different than expected, 152
  satisfaction in reaching young people, 43
  self-qualifying, 47
  situational alliances, 111–112
  special and personal concerns, 153–154
  stability and changes in attitudes, 14–15
  structural strain, 15–17
  student-centered, 23–32
  subject matter status, 33–36
  types of preferred students, 15
  understanding role, 164
  undervaluing, 104
  universal standards, 92
  working with other, 29
Teaching
  lack of respect for work, 102–104
  long time period deciding on, 47
  as profession or art, 45
  structural strains, 157–159
  struggles, 40–41
  style as individualistic endeavor, 35
Teamwork, 28
Technological culture change, 155
Television
  abetting lack of parenting, 129
  competition with subject matter, 74
  new school culture, 101
  social impact, 9–10

Thoreau, H.D., 21
Threats, 136
Threats as power, 136–138
Tolerance, 149, 151, 152
Top down, bureaucratic model, 53

U
Uncooperative students, 122–124
Unhealthy competition, 134
Unions, 164–165
Unmotivated students, 119–121

V
Voting Rights Act, 6
Vulnerability, 131–132

W
Wide decision range, 46–47

200

9 781567 502480
1-56750-248-2
201